

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Nº XXI. OCTOBER 1880.

ART. I.—THE CATACOMBS OF ROME, AND
CERTAIN PREVALENT MISCONCEPTIONS
REGARDING THEM.

1. *Monumenti delle Arti Cristiane Primitive*. Da G. MARCHI. (Roma, 1844.)
2. *La Roma Sotterranea Cristiana*. Dal Commendatore G. B. DE ROSSI. Tomi i., ii., iii. (Roma, 1864–1877.)
3. *Roma Sotterranea*. By the Rev. J. SPENCER NORTHCOTE, D.D., Canon of Birmingham, and Rev. W. R. BROWNLOW, M.A., Canon of Plymouth. New edition, rewritten and greatly enlarged. 2 vols. (London, 1879.)
4. *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*. By W. SMITH, D.C.L., LL.D., and SAMUEL CHEETHAM, M.A. Vols. i. and ii. (London, 1875 and 1880.)
5. *The Archæology of Rome*. By JOHN HENRY PARKER, C.B. Part xii. *The Catacombs*. (Oxford and London, 1877.)
6. *Katakomben-Buch, oder die Ersten Christen über und unter den Erde*. Von GEORG OTT. (Regensburg, 1878.)

THE Christian Catacombs, especially those of Rome, are a subject of undying interest to all thoughtful persons. In these gloomy vaults we are brought face to face with unquestioned and unquestionable records of the primitive Church—that ‘latebrosa et lucifugax natio,’ as the heathen contemptuously called it—and in the mouldering frescoes which look down upon us from the walls and vaults of their burial chapels, the ill-designed sculptures which crowd the face of the sarcophagi which stood in their sepulchral recesses, and above all

VOL. XI.—NO. XXI.

B

370614

in the rudely-cut and ill-spelt epitaphs, often doing defiance to the most elementary laws of orthography and of grammar, which tell us the names and ages of those who, sixteen or seventeen centuries back, were deposited in their simple *loculi*, we read a clearer testimony to its faith, its doctrines, its discipline, its ruling tone of thought and feeling, its habits of life, the social status of its members, and the ranks of life to which they belonged, and—though these are of rarer occurrence than the somewhat exaggerated statements of some writers would lead us to suppose—to its sufferings under persecution, than is to be gained from the whole circle of early Christian literature.

Since the rediscovery of these Christian cemeteries towards the close of the sixteenth century down to the present day the Roman Catacombs have had a literature of their own, ever growing in accuracy and scientific intelligence. The work of illustration and description was commenced by the indefatigable Antonio Bosio,¹ the 'Columbus of this subterranean world,' as he has been not inaptly termed, whose magnificent folio was published posthumously in 1632, and appeared again in a Latin translation with considerable alterations and omissions in the text from the hands of Aringhi² in 1651, and after the lapse of nearly a century was continued by Boldetti,³ who, however, was more of a polemic than an archæologist, and employed the Catacombs rather as a field for controversy than for scientific research; by Buonarruoti,⁴ the first adequate illustrator of the gilded glasses, almost the most curious and instructive class of objects discovered in the Christian cemeteries; and by Bottari,⁵ who, in 1737, as his great successor in the work of investigation, Padre Marchi, has sarcastically remarked, 'studying subterranean Rome quite at his ease in his library, not under but above ground,' merely republished Bosio's plates, with some additional remarks of his own, displaying more reading than research, in which he falsely attributes the paintings of a Gnostic sepulchre to Christian artists: a misappropriation which led Raoul Rochette and others to some erroneous theories with regard to the origin of Christian art. After Bottari there is again a blank of nearly a century

¹ *Roma Sotterranea*, Roma, 1632.

² *Roma Subterranea*, 2 vols., Romæ, 1651-1659.

³ *Osservazioni sopra i cimiteri de' santi martiri ed antichi Cristiani di Roma*, Roma, 1720.

⁴ *Osservazioni sopra alcuni frammenti di vasi antichi di vetro*, Firenze, 1716.

⁵ *Sculture e Pitture sagre estratte dai cimiteri di Roma*, Roma, 3 vols., 1737-1754.

in the literary history of the Catacombs, none of the Roman archæologists having had the energy to explore for themselves, or even to avail themselves of the fresh discoveries that were continually being made under their own eyes in some part or other of the Christian burial vaults. The French historian of the decline of the fine arts, Seroux d'Agincourt, in his great work, published in 1823,¹ like his precursor Bosio's, posthumously, made the first attempt for two centuries to do more than work up Bosio's materials, and to give to the world the results of any fresh investigations. But D'Agincourt was a mere historian of art. He was entirely deficient in the archæological knowledge, especially on its ecclesiastical side, essential for an intelligent view of the history of the Catacombs, and wisely restricted himself to drawing and describing what he saw. Twenty years more elapsed before the publication of the first work, since that of Bosio, which entered on any large or scientific investigation of the subject. In 1841 the learned Jesuit, Padre Marchi,² commenced his great work on the *Monuments of Early Christian Art*, the publication of which forms an epoch in the history of the Catacombs. The projected undertaking was cut short by the political disturbances of the stormy period which speedily ensued, when the Father had barely completed the first section of the first, or architectural, division of his work. In this he had happily completed the description of the plan and construction of the Catacombs, throwing a flood of light on a subject where previously the most extraordinary mistakes were prevalent, even among the learned, and for the first time demonstrating the real history of their formation. Marchi thus laid a solid foundation for the investigations of his brilliant and indomitable scholar and fellow-labourer, the Commendatore De Rossi, of whom, assisted by the practical skill of his brother, the Cavaliere Michele De Rossi, (to quote the appreciative words of Dr. Northcote), 'it were hard to say whether his talent, learning, and industry have done more for the work of discovery in subterranean Rome, or the discoveries he has made have done more for the increase of our knowledge of it.' De Rossi may be not untruly called, if not the rediscoverer of the Catacombs, certainly the first to apply the methods of scientific investigation and historical induction to the subject. De Rossi's contributions to this branch of literature commenced with the first volume of his great work on the *Christian Inscriptions of Rome*. Undertaken in 1842, announced for publication in 1844, adopted by

¹ *Histoire de l'Art par les Monumens*, 6 vols., Paris, 1823.

² *Monumenti dell' Arti primitive Cristiane*, Roma, 1844.

the late Pope, Pius IX., as a public undertaking to be paid for out of his treasury, in 1846, the year of his accession, it was delayed by various causes, public and private, for twenty years, the first volume, which deals only with the chronology of the subject, not appearing till 1864. Sixteen years have passed and we have no tidings of the second volume; and, 'political complications having now added their quota to the many hindrances of the work,'¹ 'misgivings' may well be felt 'lest the magnificent volume published should remain always an *opus imperfectum*.' The same year which saw the publication of the *Inscriptions* also gave to the world the first instalment of the result of De Rossi's researches in the Christian Catacombs, in the first volume of his *Roma Sotterranea*. The second volume followed after a moderate interval in 1867, and was succeeded after ten years' delay in 1877 by the third volume, to be followed, if life and power last, and the political and religious conditions of Rome interpose no insuperable obstacle, by other volumes on the same scale and plan. The vastness of the work he has proposed to himself—nothing less than the history and description of all the subterranean cemeteries of Rome, to be published in successive volumes as local circumstances permit—and the conviction that we can hardly expect to find the same enthusiasm, knowledge, keenness of insight, and indefatigable patience and power of enduring continuous labour, reunited in another investigator, add an emphasis to the salutation with which the late Dean Milman fifteen years ago took his leave of him at the close of an article we shall often have occasion to refer to in the following pages²—'May you live a thousand years!' Certainly considering the extent and variety of his undertakings, the magnificent scale on which these undertakings are conducted, the narrow threescore years and ten to which it has pleased Divine Providence to contract the life of man, that span would seem to offer but insufficient space for the full accomplishment of De Rossi's ambitious schemes.

In these magnificent volumes, following the lines laid down by Padre Marchi, De Rossi has carefully developed the history of the complicated network of galleries—to an untutored eye 'a mighty maze without a plan'—which forms the cemetery of S. Callixtus, and traced its gradual growth, corridor after corridor, story below story, one sepulchral area after another absorbed in the vast necropolis; discerning, with a keenness of observation acquired by an almost daily

¹ *Epitaphs of the Catacombs*, by J. S. Northcote, D.D., p. 13.

² Milman's *Essays*, p. 500.

study of the Catacombs, the dates at which each of the countless 'cubicula' and intricately ramified corridors were excavated, and the successive epochs to which they and the works of art which decorate them belong.

Whatever exceptions may be taken to some of the author's conclusions, the three volumes must be regarded as a marvel of persevering labour, minute research, and accurate observation, directed by keen power of critical discrimination and an ability to generalize from scattered and often obscure data, rendering them by far the most valuable contribution towards our knowledge of the Christian antiquities of Rome that has appeared in modern times.

But with all our appreciation of the mass of archæological information contained in the last, and in some respects most important, volume added by De Rossi to his series of magnificent quartos, we confess that it has caused us considerable disappointment. We had been led to hope that it would have contained in a collected form the result of his investigations into the history of the *Cæmeterium Domitillæ*, which have identified that burying-place beyond all question with the Catacomb of the Tor Marancia near the Ardeatine Way. The monuments and inscriptions discovered in and around this very remarkable cemetery have, in the words of the Bishop of Durham,¹ 'established beyond any reasonable doubt the connexion of this Christian cemetery with the wife of Flavius Clemens, the Emperor Domitian's cousin-german, his colleague in the consulship, and father of the two boys designated by him as successors to the imperial throne—that same Flavia Domitilla, herself the emperor's niece, banished by him to one of the islands, on the same charge for which her husband suffered capitally, which, designated as 'atheism' and 'a tendency to Jewish custom' by Dion Cassius,² may almost certainly be identified with the profession of Christianity. The character of the architecture and arrangements and the style of the paintings which decorate its vaulted roofs—quite Pompeian in their exquisite grace—indicate the same early date for the construction of this catacomb, while the publicity of the building which forms its vestibule, 'so unlike the obscure doorways and dark underground passages which lead to other catacombs,' 'seem to justify the belief that it was erected under the protection of some important personage, and during a period of quiet such as intervened between the death of Nero

¹ *The Epistle of S. Clement of Rome*, p. 258.

² lxvii. 14: ἐπνέχθη δὲ ἀμφοῖν ἔγκλημα ἀθεότητος, ὑφ' ἧς καὶ ἄλλοι ἐς τὰ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνη ἐξοκέλλοντες πολλοὶ κατεδικάσθησαν.

and the persecution of Domitian.' From the extraordinary interest belonging to this catacomb, in its connexion with the fact that 'strange as it may appear, a chief stronghold of Christianity in Rome during the earliest ages was the imperial palace itself,' and that among the first converts of this *exitiabilis superstitio* were near relatives of the emperor, as well as from the unusual character of its construction and decorations, no one of the Roman cemeteries more imperatively calls for description by the same learned and acute pen which has made us acquainted with every innermost recess of the great Cemetery of Callixtus. We earnestly hope that its publication may not be much longer delayed. 'Ars longa, vita brevis.'

We hope on a future occasion to be allowed to call attention to the additions to our scientific acquaintance with the Catacombs of Rome furnished by De Rossi's last volume and other lately published works. Our present object is an humbler and less agreeable one, namely, to clear away some of the popular misconceptions which still prevail somewhat widely, and by which the history and objects of these monuments of primitive Christianity are too much obscured.

This is a work which indeed ought not to be necessary after two centuries and a half of investigation, and the publication of so many learned works on this subject. The erroneous ideas we have in view have been again and again exposed and refuted. But there is nothing endued with more obstinate vitality than a popular error. That averseness to taking pains in the search after truth, and the indolent acquiescence in the generally accepted, of which the great masters of history have so feelingly complained,¹ ensure the most patent falsehoods from a deserved extinction. Refuted a hundred times over, turned inside out and their utter absurdity demonstrated, you fancy them dead and buried. But no. They present themselves with the most unblushing effrontery, and claim to be accepted as unimpeachable facts. Little as such 'foes' are 'worthy of our steel,' and wearisome as it is thus 'thrice to slay the slain,' the ignorance still prevailing in some most unexpected quarters as to the origin and history of the Catacombs renders it essential that the work should be undertaken afresh.

¹ Thucyd. i. 20 : οὕτως ἀταλαίπωρος τοῖς πολλοῖς ἡ ζήτησις τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἐπείμα μᾶλλον τρέπονται. Tacit. *Annal.* iii. 19 : 'Adeo maxima quæque ambigua sunt dum alii quoque modo audita pro compertis habent; alii vera in contrarium vertunt; et gliscit utrumque posteritate.' Id. *Hist.* iv. 49 : 'vulgi . . . indiligentia veri.'

At the outset, the name *Roma Sotterranea*, which, first given by Bosio, has been handed on by successive writers to our own day, is a misnomer. The Catacombs do not lie beneath Rome—which, indeed, the law of the Twelve Tables, prohibiting intramural interment, renders impossible—but are entirely outside the city, within a radius of about two and a half miles from the Aurelian walls, subjacent to the suburban farms and villas, but in no sense beneath Rome itself. It is too late in the day to attempt to shelve the term; but one wishes it had never been invented, as it is simply misleading.

Again, when we speak of the 'Catacombs,' it is far from being generally known that the word 'Catacomb' was originally nothing more than the name of a locality, and that its present meaning is a derived one; 'catacomb' having in itself no more connection with sepulture than 'academy' with teaching, 'palace' with royalty, 'Newgate' with incarceration, or 'Bedlam' with lunacy. *Catacumbæ* was simply the designation of a piece of low ground adjacent to the well-known tomb of Cæcilia Metella,

'The stern round tower of other days,'

and the Circus of Romulus, on the Appian Way, and not far from the Basilica of S. Sebastiano, and was probably derived from being a bottom or hollow.¹ The cemeteries, as a rule, took their name from their proximity to some well-known place or familiar object. Thus we find one designated 'ad duas lauros,' another 'ad ursum pileatum,' a third 'ad septem columbas' and so on. And in the same way the cemetery beneath the Basilica of S. Sebastian was popularly known as 'Cœmeterium ad catacumbas,' 'near the hollow.' A tradition, accepted as very probable by Dean Milman, asserted that in this cemetery the bodies of the Apostles S. Peter and S. Paul found a temporary resting place. This gave it a special sanctity, and led to a general familiarity with its name, which, in its shortened form of 'catacumbas,' or 'catacumbæ,' was, writes Dr. Northcote, 'gradually applied to all subterranean cemeteries of a like character—excavations for purposes of burial not only in the neighbourhood of Rome, but also in Naples, Malta, Paris, Sicily, and wherever else

¹ Though unaccepted by De Rossi, whose strength does not lie in etymology, or by his English exponents Messrs. Northcote and Brownlow, there can be little doubt that 'catacomb' is derived from *κατὰ* and *κόμβη*, a 'hollow;' that widely spread root which we have in the Latin *cymba*, the Celtic *Cwm*, the Anglo-Saxon *Combe*, and the Provençal *comba*. —(Diez, *Etymological Dictionary of the Romance Languages*.) It is connected with the Sanscrit *kumbhas*, 'a pit.'

similar excavations have been discovered,' and eventually came to be regarded as their proper specific name.

We observe that in his recent enlarged and amended edition of his *Roma Sotterranea*, Dr. Northcote, while he acknowledges that 'the etymology of the word *catacomb* will probably never be satisfactorily ascertained,'¹ defends the view propounded by Father Marchi that the term *catacumbæ* refers to the cemetery alone, and not to the district in which it is situated, and regards as 'not altogether to be despised' the view of that learned author, accepted by De Rossi, that the word 'derives its origin from the same source as *cubiculum*, and that like *bisomus*, *trisomus*, and others, it is a hybrid word, half Latin, half Greek; the latter half coming from the same root as *accumbo*, *recumbo*, &c., and the former being the preposition *κατά*, used (as was common in later Latin) instead of *ad*,' and is therefore to be regarded 'as equivalent to *ad cæmeteria Christianorum*.'² Passing over the unfortunate selection as a 'hybrid word' of *trisomus*, a pure Greek compound, *τρίσωμος*, exactly corresponding to *τρικέφαλος*, and *τρισκελής*, it may be remarked that the distinctive name of the other cemeteries—such as *ad duas lauros*, *ad divum cucumeris*, *ad fontes*, *ad nymphas*, &c.—is unquestionably derived from the circumstances of the locality where they were situated, and that there is a complete want of evidence that the word *catacumbæ* was ever used in any other sense than a local one,³ of which indeed the instances quoted by Dr. Northcote supply most convincing testimony; and that, on the supposition that it was merely a synonym for *cæmeterium*, it is difficult to understand its being employed as a distinctive title of one particular burial place.

That the Catacombs were disused sand quarries, *arenariæ*, adapted to Christian interment, is another popular error of such venerable antiquity, and at one time so unhesitatingly accepted, that it has been difficult to dislodge it altogether; indeed it is hardly yet entirely exploded. Padre Marchi was the first to show the untenableness of the hallucination which, handed on unthinkingly from writer to writer, only needed to be confronted with the facts to be utterly disproved. Not only are the plan and arrangements of the *arenariæ* entirely different from those of the Catacombs—the former displaying

¹ *Rom. Sotterranean*, vol. i. p. 262.

² *Ibid.* p. 7.

³ The circus, erected by Maxentius, is spoken of in the *Imperia Cæsarium*, a document of the seventh century, printed by Eccard, *Corpus Hist. Med. Aev.* vol. i. p. 31, in these terms—'Maxentius terras in Palatio fecit et circum in *Catecumpas*.'

an intricate ramification of winding roads with arched sides, running in easy curves, suitable for the passage of a cart and horse; the latter exhibiting long, straight, and narrow corridors with vertical walls, intersecting one another at well-defined angles—but the strata in which they are excavated are different; the layer in which the sand-diggers worked, *pozzolana pura*, being studiously avoided by the catacomb makers, as being too soft and crumbling for their purpose. The two systems were often connected, the catacomb being entered from a sandpit road: for, to quote Mr. J. H. Parker,—to whose diligent investigations, and still more to the perseverance with which, in spite of obstacles which would have daunted a less resolute spirit, he has carried out the plan he was the first to adopt, of furnishing representations of the Catacombs by the means of photography aided by the magnesian light, the archæological world owes so deep a debt of gratitude—‘these sandpit roads were admirably calculated to give access to the Catacombs, and to carry away the sand dug out in making them.’¹ Instances also are not wanting in which *arenariæ* have actually been converted into Christian cemeteries. But the perfect distinctness of the two modes of construction, which is apparent on even a superficial examination, is still more fully proved by the alterations found necessary in the cases in which a sand quarry has been adapted to the purposes of burial, so that, in the words of Dr. Northcote,² ‘although a catacomb might easily be so amplified as to resemble an *arenaria*, nothing could convert an *arenaria* into a catacomb except a process which could plainly tell its own story.’

The romantic fable needs no serious refutation which represents the Catacombs as ‘the only dwelling places, the only churches’ of the primitive Christians, as not only ‘their place of repose after death, but of their actual living,’ and describes the Christians themselves as ‘for two or three continuous centuries *lucifugæ*, as if always shrouding themselves in darkness from the face of their enemies, as a people constantly and habitually *under the earth*.’³ We may account for the currency it has obtained and which it so little deserves, by the readiness with which it lends itself to the purposes of the storytellers who, whether Roman or Anglican, ‘with one voice, from mistaken devotion or indulgence in poetic phrases, we hope not from wilful deception,’ have so fatally falsified Church history, imbuing the minds of the young or half-educated with

¹ *Catacombs*, p. viii.

² *Rom. Sott.* vol. i. p. 382.

³ Milman’s *Essays*, p. 478.

pleasing fictions which it is hard to get rid of. Certainly no one who has personally inspected the Catacombs needs any argument to convince him of the impossibility of a large number of persons maintaining existence for any length of time in those networks of narrow galleries and cramped chambers, almost without ventilation, and entirely without drainage, which the congregation of human beings, with their natural needs, would speedily render not unwholesome merely, but absolutely poisonous. That in times of persecution, which was far more intermittent than is generally supposed, the Christians were driven to take refuge in these vast and unexplored depths, and really made these dens and caves of the earth their sojourning places, may be readily credited. But, as Mr. Parker has truly said,¹ 'the Catacombs were never intended nor fit for dwelling places, and the stories of persons living in them for months are probably fabulous. According to modern physicians, it is impossible to live many days in the caves of *pozzolana*'—he should have said *tufa*—'in which many of the Catacombs are excavated.' It could be only under very exceptional circumstances that they were used as places of general habitation, and then for the briefest possible time.

We pass from the Catacombs as dwelling places to their supposed use as places of worship. Here we are on somewhat different ground. Although the language sometimes employed with reference to the subject, and which is implied in the very title of Dr. Maitland's very pleasing and interesting work, the *Church in the Catacombs*, which was almost the first to popularize any scientific knowledge of these sacred cemeteries in England, is not free from exaggeration, there is more solid foundation for the idea that the Catacombs were used for religious gatherings in times of persecution. This appears so plain to the most recent and searching investigators, that 'to deny,' writes Dr. Northcote, 'in the face of recent discoveries, that some chambers in the Catacombs were designed and used as places of worship during the early ages, would be, in the opinion of De Rossi, "to close one's eyes against the light of the sun at noonday."' Appeal may be made in support of this assertion to the very remarkable series of chambers, link beyond link, running at right angles to the general corridor, brought to light by Padre Marchi in the Cemetery of S. Agnes, or, as it is now more correctly designated, the *Cœmeterium Ostrianum*. The only probable explanation of this unusual arrangement is that it was intended to serve for common

¹ *Catacombs*, p. 26.

worship. The whole length of this chain of crypts is forty-five feet by nearly seven in width; while its height, more than double that of such chambers usually, indicates a more than ordinary destination. We know that at this epoch the worshippers were separated according to their sexes, and just such a separation meets us here. We find a division presumably for female worshippers on one side of the gallery, and for males on the opposite side. At the end of this latter is what now would be called the chancel or choir, with an episcopal chair hewn out of the rock in the centre, and a low stone bench on either side for the *consensus presbyterorum*. A niche on either side corresponds to the lateral *exedrae* of the primitive churches. Indeed, the general correspondence is so remarkable that De Rossi is justified in saying that 'in this remarkable excavation we have all the essential features of a Basilica.'¹

The architectural evidence derived from other Catacombs fully confirms the view of the occasional use of the subterranean cemeteries for sacred gatherings. After a careful consideration of the facts, Dean Milman, by no means disposed to accept such hypotheses without searching investigation, acknowledges that 'the Catacombs may, in those dark days of calamity, have become places of worship, even worship of martyrs, whose holy example the pious fugitives might at any time be called upon to follow.'² Taking the Cemetery of Callixtus, which has been the chief field of De Rossi's investigations—as intelligent as they are conscientious—as a typical example, we find the earliest *cubical* or burial chambers (opening out of the *ambulacra* on either side, with all the regularity of the chambers in a long passage of a modern house) of small dimensions, rarely double, unprovided with *luminaria* or air shafts, without any signs of having been intended as places of assembly, but merely as family burial vaults. The later *cubicula*, on the other hand, made about the middle of the third century, are of larger size, and in De Rossi's view were 'manifestly adapted for use as places of meeting.' Those still later, 'belonging to the latter half of the third century and the beginning of the next,' are much more fully developed, forming 'spacious quadrangular chambers not only double but triple, even quadruple, with other lateral appendages.' 'In the Cemetery of S. Soteris, of still later date, they become polygonal with apses and vaulted roofs, and look more like subterranean mausoleums.' When

¹ *U.s.* p. 487.² Northcote and Brownlow, *R. S.* pp. 229-234.

we reach the second half of the fourth century, the grandeur of proportions and magnificence of design of these *cubicula* attains its highest degree of perfection, but 'there being no longer any need for such subterranean gathering places, they are not arranged with a view to large assemblies of the faithful for the purposes of religious worship.' The conclusion of De Rossi's investigations is thus clearly stated by Dr. Northcote:—

'Taking this analysis as our guide—and we could hardly have one more sure and trustworthy—it would seem that in the first two centuries the Catacombs were not made with a view to any general congregation of the faithful, and do not contain chambers that could have been conveniently so used; but that this use of them began about the middle of the third century, and became still more frequent as time went on. The fossors having learnt the capabilities of the material they were at work upon, and the demand for increased accommodation to which they were constantly liable, grew more ambitious in their architectural efforts, and at length produced that suite of chambers which has already been described as combining to make a perfect subterranean church. When the necessity for such churches ceased, they became fanciful in their choice of forms, and excavated circular or polygonal mausoleums.'

This result of De Rossi's archæological researches, as epitomized by Dr. Northcote, accords with historical evidence. The first imperial interference with the free use of the Catacombs was that of Decius, A.D. 257, and was aimed expressly against their use as places of assembly, forbidding 'all Christian assemblies and all visits to the places called cemeteries' under the severest penalties.¹ It was of course

'impossible that Christians should acquiesce in this prohibition. Being forbidden to meet in the ordinary places of gathering for worship and the celebration of the sacred mysteries, or to assemble in the *cellæ* or *memoriæ* built above ground over the subterranean cemeteries, they were driven to seek more secret places for their worship. No places could afford a more secure retreat than the Catacombs, where, as soon as suitable provision was made, they accordingly met.'

Pope Sixtus II., A.D. 258, soon paid the penalty of his disobedience² to this prohibition, together with his four deacons, in

¹ Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 11: οὐδαμῶς ἐξίσταται οὔτε ὑμῖν οὔτε ἄλλοις τισὶν ἡ συνόδους ποιεῖσθαι ἢ εἰς τὰ καλούμενα κοιμητήρια εἰσιέναι. *Acta Proconsularia Sancti Cypriani*, c. i. apud Ruinart. p. 261: 'Paternus, Proconsul . . . adjecit . . . ne in aliquibus locis conciliabula fiant, nec cœmeteria ingrediantur. Si quis itaque hoc tam salubre præceptum non observaverit capite plectetur.'

² Cyprian, *Epist.* 80: 'Xystum in cimiterio animadversum sciatis . . . et cum eo diaconos quatuor.'

the Catacomb of Prætextatus, nerving S. Cyprian for his own martyrdom at Carthage by the intelligence of the Christian fortitude with which he and his ministers had met their death. With the close of that fearful period, when the enemy of the truth 'had great wrath, knowing that he had but a short time,' and the triumph of the Christian faith under Constantine, the Church resumed, with her other rights and immunities, the possession of her cemeteries: not now, however, as places of assemblage for religious worship and the celebration of the Sacraments of the Church—for which the Basilicas, rising, under the Emperor's patronage, over the resting-places of the more celebrated saints, were affording spacious and magnificent shelter—but for their primary purpose for the interment of the departed and the annual commemorations of the martyrs and the anniversaries of the faithful deceased, with which an Eucharistic celebration was inseparably connected. For such purposes the accommodation provided by the ordinary burial-chapels or *cubicula* was sufficient. To quote Dr. Northcote again,

'For merely partial gatherings, such as the members of a single family at a funeral or an anniversary, the small subterranean chambers which are so abundant through every part of the Catacombs might have sufficed; while for any larger and more general congregations such as might have been expected to assist at the feasts of the martyrs, it was possible to provide additional room in other supplementary chambers in the neighbourhood, whence the worshippers might have gone in person to the chamber in which the actual celebration had taken place, that they might there receive the Bread of Life from 'the president;' or, according to the discipline of those days, it might have been brought to them by the deacons or inferior ministers.'¹

It may seem cruel to destroy so fair a fabric of romance, and to drag up the early Christians from the picturesque gloom of subterranean hiding-places to the open sunlight, but a calm survey of the facts shows that the idea conveyed by the popular phrase, 'the Church of the Catacombs,' is not borne out by existing evidence, either historical or archæological; and that while there is no reasonable doubt that the subterranean cemeteries were used in times of persecution, both as hiding places from the fury of the enemies of the Faith, and as places of social worship and Eucharistic celebrations, it was certainly only under exceptional circumstances that they were so employed, and that these circumstances were of far rarer occurrence than the highly-

¹ *Roma Sotterranea*, vol. i. p. 240.

coloured language of some writers, drawing more from their imagination than from facts, has depicted. Indeed there is little question that the Christians, though at all times exposed to the outbursts of popular violence, when the cry *Christiani ad leones* was raised to satisfy the demand for victims on whom to wreak their vengeance for military disasters, unfruitful seasons, droughts, famines, earthquakes, and other public calamities, and though liable at any moment to be punished legally for practising an illicit religion, if anybody chose to press the charge against them—'No special edict was required,' writes the calm and philosophic Dean Merivale, 'to drag them before the altar of Jupiter, and invite them to sprinkle it with incense and conceive a vow to the genius of the Emperor'—'were yet,' 'during by far the greater part of the period between the Neronian and the Diocletian persecutions, in general, as free and secure as the other inhabitants of Rome. Their assemblies were no more disturbed than the synagogues of the Jews or the rites of other foreign religions;' ² while the ordinary laws relating to the burial of the dead secured them in the possession of their funeral *areae* no less than their pagan fellow-citizens, and protected them from interference in carrying out their obsequies. The notion, so long and so widely prevalent, that the vast network of excavations comprised in the Roman Catacombs could have been carried out secretly and in defiance of existing laws, and that the thousands of corpses reposing in their *loculi* could have been carried to the grave and deposited in their last resting place without the cognizance of the authorities of the city, has been justly designated by Professor Mommsen as 'ridiculous, and reflecting discredit, as unfounded as it is unjust, on the imperial police of the capital.' ³

In close connexion with this misconception we may mention another, fostered by the official decrees and present practice of the authorities of the Church of Rome, as to the claims of those whose remains repose in the Catacombs to be regarded as martyrs, and the marks by which these claims are supposed to be verified. When we take into consideration the utter disregard for human life, especially slave life, exhibited by the ancient Romans in the wholesale butcheries with which the majesty of offended law was vindicated, as well as the language of Prudentius as to 'the multitude of

¹ Merivale, *History of the Romans under the Empire*, vol. vi. p. 451.

² Milman, *History of Christianity*, book iv. c. ii. p. 329, note 2.

³ *Contemporary Review*, May 1871.

the just' slain by the 'wicked rage of the worshippers of the pagan gods,' and the statements of Eusebius¹ and Lactantius,² almost contemporary witnesses, as to the crowds, too great to be executed singly, who sealed their testimony to the Faith with their death, we may be warranted in deeming the conclusions of Dodwell's treatise, *De Paucitate Martyrum* (even though styled by Dean Milman 'unanswered and unanswerable'), as somewhat overstrained, and may hesitate altogether to set aside the traditions of the Church on this point. The 'light of historic truth,' when 'let into the dark jungle of legend which darkens and bewilders the early Christian annals,'³ dispels many of the highly-coloured and exaggerated fables of the Bollandists and other martyr-ologies, and seriously reduces the ranks to whom the martyr's palm may be justly assigned; but, in Dr. Northcote's words, 'there seems to be no solid reason for calling in question the truth of what ancient authorities generally have told us, however difficult it may be in this or that particular instance to verify the number recorded.'⁴ The case, however, is perfectly different when we turn our attention to particular instances, and come to weigh the precarious evidence by which the graves of supposed martyrs are sought to be identified. The palm branch, incised on the closing slab of the *loculi*, though authoritatively declared by the 'Congregation of Relics' (April 10, 1688) to be an indisputable evidence of a martyr's tomb, has had to yield before the proofs of its being found on tombs for which no such claim could be put forward—*e.g.* those prepared by individuals in their lifetime, of young children, and of a schismatic bishop, as well as of pagans. The supposed instruments of torture, similarly engraved, or in some instances actually found within the *loculus*, are repudiated by De Rossi himself, who remarks that, while we may accept as a certain truth the 'special veneration with which the faithful sought to gather together and bury with the martyr every relic bearing witness to his testimony to the Faith, every object stained with his blood, and testifying to his martyrdom,' the greatest circumspection and attentive examination of the 'facts of the case are required on applying these historical notices to the objects discovered in the tombs of the Catacombs.'⁵ Bronze *styli*, apparently piercing martyrs' skulls, prove on examination to be merely hairpins. Horrible scrapers and claws, *ungula* or *fidi-*

¹ Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 2, 11.² *De Mort. Persec.* c. xv.³ Dean Milman, *Essays*, p. 479.⁴ *Rom. Sotter.* vol. i. p. 310.⁵ De Rossi, *Rom. Sotter.* vol. iii. p. 622.

cula, long preserved in the Christian Museum at the Vatican and regarded with holy horror, have been removed since it has been proved that they came from a pagan Etruscan tomb. The nails, which are not of unfrequent occurrence within the tombs, or affixed to the plaster at the mouth of the *loculi*, he holds with Buonarruoti to have been fastened up, like the other strangely miscellaneous articles attached to the closing mortar, as 'sign-posts by which the particular *loculus* might be identified by friends who wished to visit the last resting places of their beloved one,' for which purpose they took anything that came to hand, no matter what it was. Whether this theory be accepted, or whether we hold with Raoul Rochette that the practice was merely a survival of the desire, so deep seated in human nature, to connect the life beyond the grave with that in this world by furnishing the graves with the same articles that surrounded the departed while still alive, De Rossi's calm verdict effectually disposes of the notion that these objects have any connexion with martyrdom, or, as Cavedoni has with much ingenuity endeavoured to establish, with Christian symbolism at all. De Rossi's repudiation of the idea that the oyster-shells—such as those with which the Christian rabble at Alexandria scraped Hypatia to death—the tusks and teeth of animals, and other similar objects found stuck into the plaster of the graves, were instruments or even symbols of martyrdom, is a powerful confirmation of the conscientious character of his investigations. No one has done more than this learned archæologist—as accurate as he is acute, and as earnest in his search for truth as he is quick in discovering it—to withdraw the Catacombs and their contents from the domain of romance to that of sober history and scientific investigation. May the time be not far distant when they will be equally withdrawn from the domain of polemics, and cease to be the battle-field of rival theological systems, forcing these silent records to speak a language which, so far as it is distinctively Protestant or distinctively Roman, is equally foreign to their primitive simplicity!

In the ages of unquestioning faith before our present critical epoch, no indication of martyrdom was deemed so certain as the small glass vessel containing a reddish sediment often found pressed into the mortar at the edge of a *loculus*. This was held to have been the receptacle of the martyr's blood, which we know, from the verses of Prudentius, as well as from the Acts of the Martyrs and other records, was eagerly collected in sponges and napkins by the faithful, and preserved as a sacred amulet to guard them and their descendants

from evil,¹ and which it is assumed was buried with them. We say *assumed*; for though the portions of De Rossi's and Messrs. Brownlow and Northcote's works relating to this controverted point assert, as a fact, that 'the faithful often placed the blood in glass or terra-cotta vessels of different forms and sizes,'² and give reports of several discoveries of glass vessels containing a dark liquid, the only ancient authority in support of their statement is that of the late and credulous Nicephorus Callisti (who, it is not always remembered, lived in the reign of our Edward III., and was writing at the same time with Froissart), who mentions the blood of S. Euphemia having been 'taken up and divided in small glass vessels.'³ In the face of testimony the honesty of which we have no right to impugn, we may accept as a fact that bottles containing a substance in a semi-fluid state have been discovered in the Catacombs—one so recently as 1872 in the Cemetery of S. Saturninus, on the Via Salaria Nuova; but that this fluid or the sediment to which it has been most usually reduced is *blood*, rests at present on evidence far too precarious to be received without the gravest doubt. We had, indeed, believed that this hypothesis had been generally given up by the best and most unprejudiced archæologists even of the Roman Church; and it has been with some feeling of surprise that we have read the *procès verbal*, carefully drawn up by Sig. Michele De Rossi, which appears as an appendix to the most recently published volume of his brother's great work, giving the result of a microscopical and chemical analysis of the contents of the bottle found at S. Saturninus, by which their sanguineous nature is held to be established. We confess that, after a careful examination of the evidence, we cannot regard the point at issue as proved. The proceedings of the workmen by whom the bottle was discovered, who diluted the inspissated contents of the bottle with the fluid most ready to hand, and treated the flask with such carelessness that flies and other insects got into the bottle and were drowned, must be acknowledged to have seriously impaired the integrity of the matter subjected to analysis, and thrown a doubt over its results. The utmost that can be regarded as established by

¹ Prudent. *Peristephan.* v. 341 (of the martyrdom of S. Vincent at Saragossa) :—

'Plerique vestem linteam
Stillante tinguunt sanguine,
Tutamen ut sacrum suis
Domi reservent posteris.'

² Northcote, *u.s.* vol. ii. p. 331.

³ Niceph. *H. E.* xviii. 31.

this investigation, the perfect honesty of which we are most ready to acknowledge, is that there is no sufficient evidence that the liquid cannot have been blood. We must express some surprise and disappointment that the liquid was not also subjected to optical analysis by the prism. The presence or absence of the marked lines which distinguish the spectrum of blood from any other fluid would have set the question at rest for ever. Is it still too late for this trial to be made? The investigation of Père de Buch, S.J., in his work, *De Phialis Rubricatis*, satisfied that learned writer that the red substance found in the vessels he experimented on was 'the remains of the wine from the Agapæ, or possibly Eucharistic wine, corrupted and dried up.' This hypothesis, we learn from Messrs. Brownlow and Northcote¹—who with admirable candour are careful to state the evidence that makes against their view as well as that which favours it—has been still further strengthened by the analysis of the contents of an *ampulla* found in the Aliscamp at Arles in 1877, proving the liquid to be unquestionably wine.² We cannot, therefore, see on what grounds our learned authors regard 'the supposition that these *ampullæ* may have contained the remains of wine used at the Agapæ' as 'untenable,' and even call in question that these funeral feasts (miscalled *agapæ*) were ever held underground. It is unquestionable that libations of wine were poured on the graves of the departed, nor is there any reason to restrict the practice to graves above ground. As evidence of this practice it will be enough to quote one passage, out of many, from Paulinus of Nola—

'Simplicitas pietate cadit, male credula sanctos
Perfusus halante mero gaudere sepulchris.'³

We observe that there is no attempt on the part of our authors to reduce the contents of all the *ampullæ* to one category. They remark—

'That it is quite in keeping with the customs of the ancient Christians to suppose that some of these phials contained odoriferous oils and balsams, which were extensively used for honouring the faithful departed, sometimes by being placed in the tomb, and sometimes by being burnt in lamps in front of the shrines. . . . But these phials are not to be confounded with those stained with blood.'

Our readers will observe how completely the question is

¹ *U.s.* vol. ii. p. 341.

² This analysis has been described by M. Berthelot in the *Revue Archéologique* for June 1877.

³ Paulin Nolan. *Poemata*, xxvii. v. 566.

begged in the last sentence: the whole controversy being as to whether *any* are stained with blood, not if *all* are so. May we repeat the hope that spectral analysis may be able to settle the dispute!

Another controversy, which we have not room to discuss fully, is as to the exclusive use of the Catacombs by Christians as burial places.

The Christian *origin* of the Catacombs, which Padre Marchi was the first to enunciate against an almost overwhelming weight of authority, has been confirmed by the patient labours of De Rossi, and may now be regarded as fully established. But some still regard it as a moot point whether none but Christians were allowed to be interred in them, or whether they were used by Christians and pagans in common. This latter notion, which is characterized by De Rossi, whose opinion on such a point deserves the utmost consideration, as 'absurd,' has the support of Mr. J. H. Parker, and to some extent of the learned historian of the *Romans under the Empire*, Dean Merivale. The former relies chiefly for proof of his theory on the number of pagan inscriptions that have been from time to time discovered in the Catacombs, and many of which remain there still. He writes:¹

'Of the inscriptions found in the seventeenth century in the Catacombs, which are published by Boldetti and others, a large proportion (?) are pagan; and the ingenious attempt to explain away this fact—the assumption that they were all brought there to be engraved on the other side with the names of Christians—is extremely improbable as a general rule. Although it is clear that they *were so engraved in some instances (sic)*, it does not follow that these Christian inscriptions, called *palimpsests*—[We must beg leave to correct Mr. Parker's terminology; *opisthographs* is the correct designation of these slabs *re-engraved on the back*, not rubbed down to a fresh surface as in a palimpsest manuscript]—'were actually engraved in the Catacombs themselves, and the probability is quite the other way.'

We must refer our readers for De Rossi's answer to this assertion, either to the third volume of his great work,² or to the translation given in Appendix C to the first volume of Messrs Northcote and Brownlow's epitome of the same.³ Here the learned author shows that, as the previous investigator, Lupi, had remarked of the same slabs, 'the very stones themselves tell their own story, and show that they do not belong to the cemetery, but come from without.' Very many of them

¹ Parker's *Catacombs*, Introduction, p. 13.

² De Rossi, *Roma Sotterranea*, vol. iii. pp. 640 ff.

³ *U.s.* vol. i. p. 407 ff.

are not sepulchral at all, but manifestly belonged to public monuments; while those that are sepulchral in the majority of instances are proved by the inscriptions they bear to have belonged to a very different class of tombs from those with which they are found connected. The same fact is also established by the precautions taken to prove that they did not originally belong to a Christian cemetery. Either the inscribed side was turned inwards, a new epitaph being engraved on the outer side on which Christian eyes would fall, or the former inscription was carefully concealed by a layer of mortar. The only exception to this rule was when from the mutilated character of the pagan inscription, or from the irregularity of its insertion, either turned upside down or placed sideways, it was at once made clear that 'the presence of the stones was merely material, and that they had no real connexion with the name and epitaph, which properly belonged to the sepulchre.' De Rossi refers to 'hundreds of instances' of stones, either in the Catacombs themselves, or that have been taken thence, exhibiting this precaution against possible error or confusion between pagan and Christian interments, while the examples of apparent exceptions to the rule are few indeed :— 'Not a single such instance in the whole of the vast Cemetery of Callixtus, and barely one or two in all the other cemeteries in the immediate proximity of Rome.' Such examples are of more frequent occurrence in the country cemeteries. Those who were buried there were for the most part illiterate; epitaphs of any kind are rare; nor is it a matter of surprise that in these rural districts 'the untutored *fossore*s and the faithful generally failed to examine and correct the pagan stones which they used with the same intelligent care and watchful eye of which there are such clear tokens in the cemeteries belonging to the metropolis.'

A perusal of these pages will, we think, convince the unprejudiced reader that De Rossi has succeeded in proving his points, and that, as a rule, pagans were not interred promiscuously with Christians in the Catacombs, and has accounted satisfactorily for the misleading presence of pagan slabs in the Christian cemeteries.

Christian art, as preserved and exhibited in the Catacombs, offers far too wide and important a field to be entered on in the limited space at our command. We cannot, however, close our article without reference to the widely different views of the date and origin of the Catacomb paintings entertained by De Rossi and his English translators, Messrs. Northcote and Brownlow, on the one hand, and Mr. J. H. Parker on the other,

and the controversy which has thence arisen. Here again, as in former questions, the victory must undoubtedly be assigned to De Rossi. *Non omnia possumus omnes*; and it is no discredit to that veteran archæologist, whose works on mediæval architecture, especially of England, have formed an epoch in the study of that subject,¹ and whose patient investigations and liberal expenditure of money, aided by a knowledge of construction equalled by few, have thrown a new light on the earliest monuments of the architecture of Rome, if his verdict on questions of pictorial art—a jealous mistress, who suffers no rival near her throne—should be found to be based on insufficient premisses, and to be of somewhat doubtful authority. Mr. Parker's contention is that the paintings in the Catacombs are of much later date than has been usually supposed, and that nearly all of them, if not actually executed in the eighth and ninth centuries, were so largely restored at that period during the strenuous efforts made by successive Popes to revive the ancient reverence and splendour of the cemeteries, after the devastations and sacrileges committed by the Lombards under Astolphus, A.D. 756, as to have lost all claim to being regarded as genuine examples of early Christian art. With a temerity of assertion which contrasts strangely with his former repeated testimonies to De Rossi's fidelity of statement and freedom from all polemical bias, Mr. Parker has² been unhappily led to express doubts of that archæologist's perfect honesty. Mr. Parker acknowledges that on more exact information he was induced to cancel the leaves in which, on the authority of a 'Roman Catholic priest, who was a good antiquary on ecclesiastical subjects,' he 'had accused De Rossi of making the restorations;' but he still charges De Rossi with patent untruthfulness in allowing his authority to be used to establish the early date of these frescoes, 'though he himself is careful never to say so, because he knows perfectly well that three-fourths of them are of the eighth and ninth century, about the time when Charlemagne was in Rome,

¹ We refer of course to Mr. Parker's *Glossary of Architecture*, which has gradually grown from a thin pamphlet to three octavo volumes, and is awaiting a new and enlarged edition; his edition of Rickman's *History of Architecture*, with its abundant illustrations, and carefully drawn up series of dated examples; and, above all, his history of *Domestic Architecture*, which has elevated that branch of the study into an exact science. May the venerable author live to complete his Appendix to Rickman, which is intended to do for the cathedrals and churches of England what the last-named volumes have done for its houses and castles!

² *Journal of the Royal Archæological Institute*, No. 136, vol. xxxiv. p. 432.

when so many of these tombs were restored by the Popes.' To this extraordinary statement, more damaging to its author than its subject, De Rossi, through Messrs. Northcote and Brownlow, gives the most unqualified contradiction, couched, let us say to his honour, in language more temperate and courteous than such an accusation might have not unnaturally called forth. He remarks, with the serene calmness of conscious rectitude, that such a statement 'can only be accounted for by supposing that Mr. Parker has confounded in his own mind two classes of paintings that are entirely distinct, and has then reversed their relative proportions.'¹ He makes no attempt to deny that the Catacomb frescoes are of very various dates, and have been subjected at various periods to extensive restorations, or rather renovations. But he carefully distinguishes between these later works and those of the first three centuries, the age of the martyrdoms, and supplies tests by which they may be accurately discriminated. He writes:

'I have thoroughly explained in my *Roma Sotterranea* what paintings in the historical crypts (which underwent new changes even down to the eighth and ninth centuries) were—not restored but—executed *de integro* at that time; and their style enables us immediately to distinguish them from those of more ancient ages and of classical art. Some paintings were contemporaneous with the sepulchres which they adorn; others were made and often cancelled, and others substituted for them at successive periods, but only in those crypts which we call historical, which were frequented and cared for till the time when the subterranean sanctuaries were abandoned in consequence of the translation of the relics of all the more celebrated martyrs.'²

Dr. Northcote justly adds that—

'It ought not to have been necessary to make this explanation afresh, for, in truth, De Rossi has spoken plainly enough from the very first, and in all his published works; his judgment not being founded on any view of Christian theology, nor on any arbitrary theory as to the probable origin and development of Christian art in general, nor even on an examination of an indefinite number of examples considered individually, but on a very wide and careful induction, the result of his own and his brother's scientific determination of the chronology of every part of the Catacombs.'³

It is highly satisfactory to observe that the accuracy of De Rossi's conclusions has been fully accepted by such a master of historic methods, and one of such calm judicial mind, as the great German historian, Dr. Mommsen. After observing

¹ Northcote, *R. S.*, vol. ii. p. 8.

² Northcote and Brownlow, *u.s.* p. 8.

³ *Ibid.* p. 11.

that the means of investigation adopted by De Rossi in the Cemetery of Callixtus enable us to trace 'the successive execution of the individual parts of the plan in decades,' he continues:

'By this means it has become possible to obtain a chronological precision, not only with regard to epigraphy, *but also to painting*, and many other branches of archaeology, such as it would be impossible to arrive at in any other field of archaeological research. And, though some of De Rossi's assertions cannot fail to call forth some opposition, there can be no doubt that he has in a general way laid down fundamental principles and rules which will prove a lasting acquisition to science.'¹

The general conclusion arrived at—which, notwithstanding Mr. Parker's reassertion of his conviction of the late date of the majority of the Catacomb paintings, may, we think, be safely acquiesced in—is that the decorations are, as a rule, of the same date as the chambers themselves, and that, the antiquity of these chambers having been decided by historical and archaeological evidence, the paintings, if they do not offer any unmistakable marks of a later age, may be unhesitatingly referred to the same period; that restoration in the modern sense was of the rarest occurrence; and that, even when it took place, there was never any renewal or change of the subject, but only the old decaying outlines were marked out afresh by stronger and coarser contours, leaving the original picture in all essential respects, though artistically impaired, the same as before; and that the only cases where any renewal of the decorative paintings was carried out were those of the *cubicula* which had acquired a special sanctity as the resting places of celebrated martyrs.

'Experience,' writes Dr. Northcote, 'teaches us that nothing is more apt to be neglected than the sepulchral monuments of private individuals. After the lapse of a certain time when the immediate descendants of the deceased have passed away it is not uncommon to see them sacrificed altogether, if need be, to satisfy new necessities, or even new whims and caprices. And just so we find painting after painting in every part of the Catacombs—in some parts, *e.g.* in the Cemetery of S. Soteris, every painting without exception—pierced through and spoilt in order to make room for more recent graves. This does not look as if there had been any care taken to preserve them, or any system of renewing them when they fell into decay.'²

We do not know whether the evidence will be sufficient to convince Mr. Parker, and to cause him to modify his opinions,

¹ In *Neuen Reich*. 1871. *Chronik der Winckelmannsfeste*, p. 184, quoted in *R. S.* p. 12.

² *Ibid.*

but it cannot fail to lead him to be more cautious in ascribing anything approaching to intentional dishonesty—either the *suppressio veri*, or the *suggestio falsi*—to a brother archæologist of such acknowledged eminence as the Commendatore De Rossi, or to those who claim to be his exponents to English readers, Messrs. Northcote and Brownlow. It is an evil sign for the spread of truth when such investigations are carried on in a controversial and polemic spirit, or when personal feeling or religious prejudice is allowed to intrude on the ground of pure scientific investigation. All experience, however, shows, in the words of Dr. Northcote—which he, as well as his antagonist, may do well to lay to heart—‘how necessary it is for all writers, whether Catholic or Protestant, to keep strict watch over themselves in handling this topic, lest their religious prejudices should unconsciously warp their judgment.’ We cannot better conclude our article than in the words of De Rossi :

‘I consider that honesty and scrupulous severity in the proving of facts is the first duty of every writer who handles a subject so likely to raise religious controversy as that of the Early Christian monuments. I hope that my best title to the esteem and sympathy with which I am honoured by the most competent and impartial judges is the confidence with which I have inspired them by thirty years of assiduous explorations and researches, and by a complete and conscientious account of all that they have brought to light.’

O si sic omnes !

ART. II.—THE PAGAN REACTION UNDER THE EMPEROR JULIAN.

1. *The Emperor Julian—Paganism and Christianity—being the Hulsean Essay for the Year 1876.* By GERALD HENRY RENDALL, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (Cambridge, 1879.)
2. *Geschichte der Reaction Kaiser Julians gegen die Christliche Kirche.* Von FRIEDRICH RODE. (Jena, 1877.)
3. *Julien l'Apostat et sa Philosophie du Polythéisme.* Par H. ADRIEN NAVILLE. (Paris, 1877.)

It may be taken as a sign of the different characteristics of English and foreign, especially of German, scholarship, that while nothing is commoner in Germany than monographs on the lives of representative historical persons, in England they

are very rare. Our historians have preferred the more ambitious but more hazardous task of writing general histories of whole nations or periods, and have left to the more patient labour of the Germans the microscopic investigation of the lives of those who made the nations or characterized the periods. This is remarkably true with regard to ecclesiastical history. While we have many excellent works, such as Milman's *Latin Christianity*, or Canon Robertson's *Church History*, which give us a general survey of the subjects dealt with, Mr. Stephens' *Life and Times of S. Chrysostom* stands almost alone as a study of one of the great names of the Church, selected as the central figure of an epoch. In Germany, on the other hand, such monographs are frequent, and are most useful to the historical student. It is to be hoped that this example may find imitators amongst us. Biographical monographs are more humble productions, indeed, than universal and philosophical histories, but they are more interesting, and, possibly, less misleading. The fact is exemplified by the case of the Emperor Julian, who is certainly one of the most interesting of historical characters, and would, it might be thought, have found many biographers in England. And yet, as Mr. Rendall tells us in his preface, it would seem as if Gibbon's 'masterly narration of Julian's successes and failures' had prevented his countrymen from trying to get a clearer and fuller view of his life and character than was possible in the vast extent of the greatest of all histories. So we are especially grateful to the Hulsean foundation at Cambridge for having been the means of producing such a work as Mr. Rendall's, which is a worthy successor to Mr. Mason's essay on *Diocletian's Persecution*, and Mr. Cunningham's monograph on the *Epistle of Barnabas*. If, as Mr. Rendall hints in his preface, the 'gentle violence' and 'external impulse' of the Hulsean prize is necessary for the production of such studies, we hope that those who administer this and similar benefactions will continue to stimulate the energies of historical aspirants in the direction of special biographical investigation, for there can be no doubt of the value of such a work as Mr. Rendall's. Julian has been the subject of many interesting works both in Germany and France, two of the latest of which stand at the head of our article; but Mr. Rendall's is the first original English book on the subject since the curious political discussion which was started by 'Julian Johnson' in 1681, and which was more concerned with the Divine right or wrong of the Kings of England than with the insignificant question of Paganism and

Christianity in the fourth century. Mr. Rendall has well supplied the want. As far as thoroughness of research goes, not even German industry could surpass the completeness of his work, and it shows an appreciation of character which gives life to the whole, and contrasts very favourably with Dr. Rode's patient and piecemeal delineation. On the other hand, it does not, by any undue fluency of generalization, put us on our guard against anticipated inaccuracies and omissions, as too many French writers do; not, however, M. Naville, whose admirable study of Julian's philosophy is a most valuable contribution to the subject. At the same time we cannot say that Mr. Rendall's work is faultless, though as to errors of detail or mistakes in actual matters of fact, we must own that we have detected hardly any. But there are two points in Mr. Rendall's method and general treatment of the subject that might, we think, be altered with advantage.

And in the first place we will be very bold, considering that we are writing in the nineteenth century, and say at once that it would have been better had Mr. Rendall been less tolerant, or perhaps we should say less impartial. We are far, indeed, from wishing that any modern historian should falsify facts, or omit any element essential to the truth, in order thereby to justify his own prejudices; such a method of writing history has, we may hope, been at length discarded. Let us have all possible light thrown upon the actual facts, every means used to discover them and to estimate their due proportion; this is surely the *sine qua non* of historical work. But there is something more required, especially in biography: and that is to present the personages of history as they really lived, to bring them before our eyes as they appeared to their contemporaries, to explain and justify the opinion of their own age concerning them by the very description given of them. A large part, and probably far the most important part, of their historical significance consists in the influence they exerted on those with whom they dealt; and this influence greatly depended upon the opinions, good or bad, which those who knew them formed of them. The biographer, then, if he wishes to give us, not perhaps a living, but even merely a true, picture of his subject, cannot leave out of account the actual impression which the person makes upon our feelings, for that impression is, in all probability, just what was made upon his contemporaries: it is part of the historical character just as much as the actions and sayings recorded of him; and if it is omitted, if, that is, the biographer tries to be completely impartial, not only

vigour and life, but truth itself will be sacrificed. To be impartial in judging the truth of the facts related is one thing, to be impartial in judging a character is another. In the first case impartiality is necessary for ascertaining truth; in the second it is not too much to say that we cannot be true unless we are partial: for, as far as history is concerned, the meaning of a character is the impression made upon the feelings of other men; and a mere recital of actions and sayings, leaving out the feelings of repulsion or attraction with which the character inspires us, is no more true history than it would be if essential facts were omitted from the account. It would seem, therefore, that the modern reaction from the violent intolerance and false partiality of former historians has a danger of its own; and the careful balancing of facts against each other, the judicial monotony of accent, the nervous shrinking from any expression of praise or blame, tend to produce a dead level of narration, and a finally distorted view of the subject, which may be scientific, but is certainly not history. No doubt in the case of Julian there are strong inducements to a modern writer to fear partiality, for few characters have been the subject of such partisan animus on each side; but also in no case is it more necessary to allow our feelings of sympathy or antipathy free scope than in this. One great cause of Julian's failure was surely his lack of power to influence others, and this in its turn was due to the dislike and contempt which were clearly felt for him by those with whom he came in contact. The worthy soldier-historian Ammianus, though very fully recording Julian's merits and good qualities, fails to conceal his contempt for the superstitious sacrificer, and for the talkative judge who could not restrain his curiosity as to the religion of the suitors who appeared before him.¹ And the natural hatred of the Christians for the Emperor who tried to reanimate Paganism is mingled with a derision and contempt which are certainly incompatible with any power of either attracting or influencing others. Hence his efforts were not so much feared as laughed at, even by the Pagans themselves; his personal following was small, and the effect of his example in observing the rites of his religion almost *nil*, wherever, as in Antioch, there was a strong Christian feeling already existing. When Mr. Rendall, therefore, so carefully avoids all expression of his own feelings towards Julian, and is so ostentatiously impartial as, for instance, in his last

¹ Ammianus Marcellinus, xxii. 10, xxv. 4, xxii. 7.

chapter, he is really giving us a false idea of the character he has to describe. Julian was gifted with great powers; he was learned, he was clever, he was probably a great general, he was unwearied in industry; but—he was ridiculous and unpopular, and a true historical portrayal should emphasize and justify his unpopularity. In many parts of his book, indeed, Mr. Rendall has avoided this fault, and the very vigour and liveliness of his style are witnesses that his subject is to him a real living person, and not the mere theme for discussion to which Dr. Rode reduces poor Julian. But where he has most aimed at impartiality and complete toleration, there he at once fails to give us a real and true impression of the character.

This would have been less important had he not handled his subject in the way on which, in the second place, we wish to animadvert. Mr. Rendall, it seems to us, has been led away by the common mistake of making too much of his hero and too little of the circumstances in which he was placed. He treats the important historical fact of the definite Pagan reaction too much in connection with Julian, and would lead us to believe that without him it would not have occurred. Therefore, nearly all his book is occupied with Julian himself, and very little stress is laid upon the popular feeling of the time, except in so far as it was hostile to Julian and his Hellenic schemes. Now this seems to us unwarranted both by the general course of history and by the particular circumstances of the case. It is not in the power of one man, however great, to bring about a reaction, however slight; and Julian was certainly not the man to do what far more powerful persons than he was have failed to accomplish. Mr. Rendall adopts the words of a writer who, perhaps, was, as he says, 'calm and generous,' but certainly not unprejudiced, and whose book is singularly one-sided in its support of a preconceived theory. M. Beugnot,¹ who wishes to show that under Constantine and Constantius there was little or no Christian attack on Paganism, and, consequently, no reaction under Julian, says, as quoted by Mr. Rendall, 'Julian's life was an accident, and at his death events reverted to their natural channel.' By endorsing this Mr. Rendall throws the whole responsibility of the reaction on Julian's shoulders, and thereby justifies his own method of making a study of Julian's character the subject of his book, instead of a full estimate of the positions held by the two parties in the middle

¹ *Histoire de la Destruction de Paganisme en Occident*, i. 221.

of the fourth century. He gives us, indeed, a summary, accurate, so far as it goes, of the religious history of the years between the Edict of Milan and Julian's accession; but for a complete explanation of the facts of the reaction far more prominence should, it seems to us, have been given to the anti-Pagan legislation and popular feeling on the one side, and, on the other, to the great numerical superiority of the Pagan party, and its hold upon the masses of the people, under Constantine and his successor. Julian's life, from this point of view, was no accident, but rather the natural result of the forces which were at work in the Empire; the 'natural channel' of events is no unbroken straight course, but an alternation of depths and shallows, rocks and headlands, which produce eddies and under-currents, and render it difficult at any one moment to pronounce upon the ultimate direction of the stream. Reaction is only produced by previous action, and is only, therefore, explained by reference to preceding events.

It is not easy to describe shortly the relative positions of Christians and Pagans during the earlier part of the fourth century. The subject is complicated not only by the difficulty of extracting the elements of truth from the rhetoric of writers like S. Gregory Nazianzen on the one side, and Libanius on the other, but by the great difference that existed between the East and West in regard to religion. In a rhetorical passage,¹ Lacordaire asserted that Constantine left Rome and founded a new capital in the East in order to allow the

¹ *Œuvres*, iv. 170. It is strange to find M. Renan, in his recent *Hibbert Lectures*, reproducing this Ultramontane conception of the religious supremacy of Rome. It is true that at the end of his course he admits that 'in the West the Christians were but a weak minority,' but immediately afterwards he calls the transfer of power to Constantinople only a 'temporary eclipse' of Rome, evidently assuming, as the basis of his whole view of Church history, that the Roman see was, before Constantine's time, the central point of the Church's power and organization. Probably the removal of the capital to Byzantium allowed the Roman see to grow up independent of the Court influence, and therefore to exercise a greater power, eventually, than any of the Eastern Churches; but it is most unhistorical to assert, or to imply, that up to the end of the third century the real living force of the Church was in the West rather than in the East. Rome played an insignificant part in the Church's development, whether we regard that development from within or from without, in the growth of organization and of doctrine, or in the contest against Paganism. In Rome the Church was obscure and feeble; in the East it was great and powerful: Constantine, therefore, was most sagacious in transferring his Court from 'le camp retranché des païens' to 'la ville des idées nouvelles.' Cf. Beugnot, i. 85, 86; De Broglie, ii. 138; Mason's *Persecution of Diocletian*, pp. 37n, 90, 151n.

Pope to exercise an unimpeded authority in the Eternal City. This view of history contrasts rather singularly with Beugnot's opinion that Constantinople was founded because of the Emperor's fear of the powerful Pagan party in Rome, and with the undoubted facts that testify to the undisturbed possession by the old religion of its temples, altars, and institutions, and the enormous numerical preponderance of the Pagans in Rome and in the West generally. The popular notion of Constantine's action seems to be that at his conversion to Christianity he at once deposed Paganism from its position as the State religion, and that in a few years it died out altogether and left Christianity in complete possession of the field. There is one fact which very strongly proves, if proof be needed, the falsity of this view. The Pontificate, *i.e.*, the official headship of the religion, which gave complete control over all the rites and ceremonies, over temples and altars, priests and vestals, was part of the Imperial functions for more than fifty years after the conversion of Constantine, and was conferred, not merely by accession to the throne, but as an office distinct and in theory separable from those which the Emperors assumed.¹ The pontifical robe was for the first time refused by Gratian in 383, when it was offered to him by the Roman priests. The refusal was a bitter blow to the Pagan party, and it drew from one of them a punning reference to the contest which the Emperor was then carrying on with Maximus: 'Si princeps non vult appellari pontifex, admodum brevi pontifex Maximus fiet.' This strictly religious office was then exercised by the declared Christians Constantine and Constantius, to say nothing of Jovian and Valens, as well as by the ardently Pagan Julian. Nor was it a mere sinecure, in the case of Constantine at least; for he passed laws regulating the position of the priests, and commanding the due inspection of the omens and auspices. Besides this he instituted sacred games, though he gave great offence to the Romans by refusing to attend the Capitoline sacrifices, and forbidding the secular games to be celebrated at Rome in 313. The fact that an Emperor who, though unbaptized, was in sympathy a Christian, and presided over the assembled bishops at the Council of Nicæa, was also both nominally and actually the official head of the Pagan religion, is a sufficient proof of the strange confusion and uncertainty of religious affairs during the time of transition. Speaking broadly, we may say that after Constantine's conversion the West re-

¹ Cf. La Bastie, *Mémoire sur le Souverain Pontificat des Empereurs Romains*.—*Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscriptions*, vol. xv. 75.

mained Pagan, the East became, outwardly, in great part Christian. The new capital was probably completely Christian, if we may trust S. Augustine's testimony¹ that Constantinople was 'sine aliquo demonum templo simulacroe.' Antioch also was distinguished for its Christian fervour, strangely mixed with luxury and effeminacy, and for its neglect of the magnificent Pagan shrines which it contained. And the general tone of writers under Constantine and Constantius shows that the old worship was, if not openly suppressed, at least very much discouraged, even in Greece, the home of the religion. Constantine had, indeed, at the beginning of his undivided reign, attempted to suppress idolatry altogether, and for a time, at least, seems to have flattered himself that he could succeed. Such is the conclusion we may draw from the two laws mentioned by Eusebius, in the first of which the Emperor decrees the abolition of the 'abominations of idolatry,' while in the second, addressing the Christians, he assumes that there will now be no obstacle to the triumph of their faith, for 'the insanity of Polytheism has been extirpated.' No doubt the exultant Christian party at the court of Constantine thought that they had only to go forward in the course they had already begun in order completely to wipe out the old pollutions of the Pagan system. To those who had watched the gradual growth of the Church, her recovery from persecution, her increasing acquisitions of land and buildings, her gathering numbers, and, lastly, her victorious endurance of the latest and most tremendous trial of Diocletian's persecution, it might well seem that the only thing wanting to complete her triumph was the accession of the Emperor himself to their side; and when that actually came to pass they set no bounds to their hopes and arrogant prognostications. For arrogant enough were these court-bishops, now on the summit of the wave of Imperial favour and worldly success. Few things are more repellent to the Christian reader of history than the descriptions of the demeanour and conduct of the principal Churchmen of the period in which, for the first time, the spiritual and temporal powers seemed to become united. And their arrogance showed itself in their contemptuous treatment of the old religion, which, corrupt and polluted and foul with many diseases and rank with unheard of abominations as it was, was yet still the form in which had been cast for many ages all the spiritual strivings, all the vague devotion, all the artistic impulses of great and intel-

¹ *De Civit. Dei*, v. 25.

lectual peoples. Even for a Christian who knows what a marvellous life there really was in the Church, though hidden underneath the luxuriant growth of hypocrisy and covetousness, and who knows the unspeakable depravity of the Hellenic religion, and how wildly grotesque were the Oriental importations and the fantastic juggleries and pompous incantations which had laid hold of the popular mind, it is difficult not to think that it was ignorant intolerance which led the representative Christians, the bishops and the writers of Constantine's and Constantius' time, to trample upon the still living body of the old faith, and to demand, with persistent outcries, the utter suppression of its worship, its rites, and its sacrifices. It was ignorant, for Constantine very soon found how vain was the attempt to put down by force the ceremonies to which the people were accustomed. The law was either allowed to fall into abeyance, or was actually and formally repealed in the edict in which he deplures 'the violent and seditious obstinacy with which many remain firmly in their pernicious errors.' Whatever the bishops at his court may have been, Constantine was a statesman, with a statesman's desire for unity and peace, and a statesman's inclination for using religion as a means rather than as an end. Peace he thought to have obtained by uniting his empire in one faith, and with a wise foresight he selected the young and vigorous Christian religion rather than the moribund Paganism for this purpose; but when he found that this unity could not be produced by a stroke of the pen, or even by external pressure, he retraced his steps, and confined himself to encouraging the Christian rather than suppressing the Pagan worship. And with this encouragement the Church, though torn by internal dissensions, did go forward and prosper in the Eastern portion of the Empire. Only in special cases, indeed, where the immoralities of the Pagan ceremonial were too flagrant, or where, as in the case of the temple built on the site of the Holy Sepulchre, the sentiment of the Christian world was openly outraged, did Constantine himself interpose to destroy temples or shrines by his sovereign authority.¹ But, encouraged by his well-known sympathies, the Christian populace took the law into their own hands, and in many towns flourishing 'houses of prayer' erected on the ruins of the temples attested the distinctiveness and the piety of a mob of converts.²

In the East, then, the decay of Paganism had fairly begun, and its adherents and sympathizers afterwards pointed to

¹ Euseb. *Vit. Const.* iv. 25, iii. 26, 55.

² Sozom. ii. 5.

Constantine as the first sacrilegious enemy of their faith, the first to light the spark which became a conflagration.¹ But in the West the old religion still maintained its supremacy; altars and temples were still dedicated to the gods; and while Symmachus in later times could appeal to Constantine as an example of tolerance, we learn from the certain evidence of inscriptions that this so-called destroyer of Paganism, this summoner of councils, this arbiter of doctrines, was after his death actually worshipped as a god in Rome—the city which, according to Lacordaire, he left that the head of the Christian religion might have there an unrivalled pre-eminence. Beyond the irritation of the Romans at Constantine's neglect of their games, it would be difficult to say that in the West there was any result of the conversion of the Emperor to Christianity.

Nor was it otherwise in the reign of Constantius. He and his brother began with a peremptory renewal of Constantine's abortive edict against Pagan rites. This was repeated twelve years later in still stronger terms, decreeing the punishment of death against all who were guilty of sacrificing or of worshipping idols. A law directing the preservation of the fabric of some of the temples in which games were accustomed to be celebrated begins with the comprehensive words: '*Quantum omnis superstitio penitus eruenta sit.*' By such measures and expressions the young Emperors showed their zeal against Paganism, although we are bound to say that M. Beugnot sees in the last quoted edict a mere exercise of the Pontifical functions, and asks, '*L'empereur le plus dévoué au paganisme, le souverain pontife le plus scrupuleux, aurait-il pu motiver différemment cette loi?*' It must, however, have been a strange devotion to Paganism that could begin a law by assuming the necessity for its destruction; a similar argument would include Cato among the most devoted defenders of Carthage. What we are told by the laws is confirmed by the evidence of both heathen and Christian writers of the period. The heathen historians and orators give most gloomy accounts of the state of their religion during this reign. In some great cities few could remember the celebration of heathen ceremonies; in others, those who were in the secret knew that the Pagans were praying that their suppressed worship might be restored by means of the accession of some sympathizer to the throne; in others, the Christians were so openly triumphant that the temples and altars were not only closed and forbidden, but overturned and destroyed; and one

¹ Juliani *Op.* i. 424, ii. 54; Libanii *Op.* iii. 435.

of the bitterest grievances was that the worship of the gods was suppressed in order that the treasures of their shrines should be divided among the motley crew of eunuchs, barbers, cooks, and servile court-bishops that infested Constantinople and the palace of the Emperor. When an old religion is perishing before the victorious progress of a new faith, it might be expected, or at least hoped, that the leaders of the conquering party should be the best representatives of their creed—those who should display in their own persons the superiority of their system over that which is dying out. But, strange to say, the very reverse of this is shown us by the unanimous testimony of contemporary writers. Constantius' court was a byword for corruption, hypocrisy, greed, and licentiousness of every description, and the foremost examples of these vices were all, apparently, devout Christians. Constantius himself, one of the most despicable tyrants that ever lived, devoted himself with eagerness to the complicated theological discussions of the time, and by his example and precept increased the manifold distractions and hatred that were tearing the Church and partly disgusting, partly amusing, the contemptuous Pagans. If we do not find the old religion so much persecuted as we should have expected, it is because the Emperor's time was occupied in imprisoning and torturing the best and most loyal adherents of the new. If we are surprised to find Libanius undisturbed in his lecture-room at Antioch, we must remember that the Bishop of Rome was an exile, and the great Athanasius was wandering in the desert of the Thebais, a fugitive with a price on his head. But in spite of the violent dissensions and internal corruption of the Church, the Pagan party was unable to make head against Christianity. Though in Alexandria the worship of the gods still flourished, and in Athens a sympathetic traveller might still find temples which he could visit, and sacrifices in which he could join,¹ yet in most parts of the East the people seemed to be acquiescing in the suppression of their former religion, and looking on without a protest while temples were robbed and altars overturned.

But we can hardly believe we are reading of the same period when we turn to the accounts of Rome and the West generally. Not a word is said by any Western writer of the cessation, much less of the forcible suppression, of sacrifices. On the contrary, in Rome the old ceremonies went on unchecked; the priests and vestal virgins continued their offices,

¹ Eunapius, *Vita Proares*. p. 491.

and were subject to their former discipline; the magistrates of the city built and dedicated temples and altars, and took on themselves offices in the service of Mithra, undergoing the Taurobolium and other strange rites, which signified their adherence to that worship. And more strange than all, when Constantius himself visited Rome we find him meekly acquiescing in the Pagan supremacy, and, having just enacted laws for the total suppression of the idolatrous worship, going, in Rome, the round of the great temples and admiring the ceremonies, just as any modern prince would be taken by the municipal authorities to see and attend service in the cathedral, along with the other sights of a city. It is difficult indeed to exaggerate the strange contradictions we meet with at every step during this period of transition between the ancient and the modern worlds. Society was undergoing a great change without knowing it, and even those who were foremost in bringing it about very often failed to see the consequences of their actions, and became, to our eyes, extraordinarily inconsistent and wavering. But the broad distinction may be made that while the Eastern part of the empire was gradually becoming Christian, the West remained to a very great extent completely Pagan, not even concerning itself with the growth of this strange organization, the Christian Church. And when we say that the East was becoming Christian, it must be remembered that even there the majority was probably Pagan, and that the success of the Church was owing to the indifference of the heathens to their own religion, rather than to any superiority in force on the side of Christianity. The adherence of the Emperor was the one thing needed to hasten the conversion of many lukewarm Pagans, and it may be conceived that such converts were no very creditable or powerful acquisitions to the side that gained them. But even in the East this change was not being effected quite silently or without protest. We have ample evidence that those whose wealth or renown depended upon the maintenance of the old religion or its new superstitious accretions, the sophists, the priests, the theurgists, were secretly praying and working for some favourable change in the condition of things at court. They could enlist on their side the passions of the mob when the popular ceremonies and quasi-religious games were attacked; they were supported by the sympathies of men of letters, who saw in the triumph of Christianity the neglect of the great poets of Greece; and, above all, they felt that their own new philosophy was on its trial, that doctrine of Neo-Platonism which, beginning with

the lofty and ascetic monotheism of Plotinus, had, by the time of Julian's accession, degenerated into the superstitious and polytheistic magic which Ædesius and Maximus developed out of the systems of Porphyry and Iamblichus. That this philosophy was a real power during the century between Plotinus and Julian there can be no doubt. Mr. Rendall gives in his third chapter a useful and interesting outline of Plotinus's system. It is important, however, in addition to his exposition, to point out somewhat more definitely than he has done the causes of its influence and of its inevitable failure.

The main longing of the human mind was, at this epoch as at most epochs, for some means of approach to the Divine Nature, some bridge over the great chasm that separates man from God. Those who have cast an amazed and shuddering glance into the fantastic developments of Gnostic systems will recognize in their endless multiplications of æons an attempt to find some such means of approach; and the Neo-Platonist philosophy was another. By Plotinus the requisite approach was given in 'an ecstatic elevation of being,' by which the soul 'might enter into actual unification or contact with God.' This ecstasy was to be gained only by long-continued asceticism, by practice in contemplation, by detachment from the things of flesh and of sense. It is true that, when attained, the Infinite Intelligence was so infinite, so undefinable, so unknowable, that it might seem scarcely satisfying to the soul to be united to it. But the mode of describing God was not so important as the mode of attaining to union with Him, and no doubt many were impelled to lead a higher life, in the midst of the decay and ruin of heathen society, by the motive that Neo-Platonism held out; and the prospect of escaping from the cramped confines of this vexed world into rapturous communion with the One was a quickening principle to many who would otherwise have wasted whatever of good was in them. But though this teaching was calculated to give partial satisfaction to one of the deepest yearnings of the mind, yet it was only partial and temporary. The rapid decadence of Neo-Platonism from Plotinus to Iamblichus shows us the real cause of its inability to give a complete solution of 'the great world-problem;' for that decadence consisted in this, that each successive teacher, being at liberty to add whatever he chose to the system, because it had no basis of historical reality, gradually degraded the pure doctrine of Plotinus by incorporating into it popular ideas and legendary fancies, till that which had

once been the strictest Monotheistic idealism, became not only completely Polytheistic, but also a system of magical practices and grotesque superstitions. The success, therefore, of Neo-Platonism was due to its recognition of the craving for union with God; its failure was owing to the want of any foundation of historical truth which should control as well as inspire the expositors of its doctrine. Hence there was no check to the fantastic imaginations of subsequent teachers; the very nature of Plotinus' system was the cause of the developments of Iamblichus and Maximus, for while his pure idealism made some concession to popular superstition necessary, if it was to become a popular religion, the arbitrary fancifulness of its doctrines made it easy to introduce any number of theories and practices by which the people could be attracted. As Mr. Rendall well points out, 'under Iamblichus the school entered upon a new stage.' Philosophy became religion; idealism degenerated into spiritualism; contemplation was exchanged for magic, monotheism for a whole hierarchy of popular divinities; Plotinus gave place to Maximus. This rapid collapse—for the whole development occupies little more than a century—shows that there was a fatal flaw in the system, adapted though it was to some of the religious instincts of man; and that flaw was obviously its want of historical truth. What Mr. Rendall says in distinguishing it from Christianity we may quote as also explaining its failure: Christianity 'reposed on objective historical facts, by which it declared God was brought down to man; while Neo-Platonism, from a purely subjective basis, claimed to enable men to rise to God.'

Such was, then, the state of the Eastern world about the year 350. The adherents of the old religion were crushed under a victorious Christian minority; that minority itself was racked and torn by fierce and minute controversies; a strange and superstitious system had a certain hold upon men's minds; scholars were foreboding the disappearance of polite learning; the populace were bitterly resenting, in many places, the abolition of their old heathen rites and bright ceremonies; and at the head of this strange medley was a narrow and jealous tyrant, whom it was impossible either to respect or to conciliate. What wonder if the leaders of the Pagan party were eagerly, though secretly, looking out for some instrument by which their supremacy could be restored? And when it appeared that the gods were providing an apt tool for their purposes, we can easily imagine how reluctant they would be to let such a prize slip. At this juncture it

was gradually whispered about that, of the two youths who stood nearest to the childless Emperor, one, the younger, was keen and ready-witted, devoted to study, and to study of the old Greek poets and philosophers; and though a Christian, and probably an unquestioning Christian, yet with all the marks of an eagerly inquisitive mind easily swayed by the influence of his teachers, and not unlikely to be powerfully attracted by the weird jargon and spiritual impostures of the theurgists. This was their opportunity, and they resolved to profit by it. The ground had indeed been well prepared. The boy who had been rescued, it is difficult to say how, from the slaughter of all but one of his nearest relatives, would not be likely to have a bigoted attachment to the creed of the foremost murderer, and Constantius' religion was not likely, on other grounds, to have attracted a naturally devout and imaginative mind. Brought up, almost in daily terror of death from the savage jealousy of the Emperor, by strangers—an Arian bishop, a hypocritical sophist, a Scythian eunuch—Julian had a strange training for his subsequent position; but such a training affords a satisfactory explanation of his mental and religious peculiarities. Mr. Rendall, quite unjustifiably, as it seems to us, shows an inclination to take Julian's sarcastic description of his earliest pedagogue, Mardonius the eunuch, as seriously meant. But this is surely a mistake. Whatever may have been the failings of the philosophical Scythian, Julian was hardly the person to complain of them, seeing how congenial to his mind was the rigid stoicism and pedantry of his instructor; and nothing can be clearer than the irony with which, in the *Misopogon*, he contrasts with Mardonius' severity the gay and theatre-loving character of the Antiochenes. Whether Mardonius' harsh restraint was a wise education for such a nature or not, there can be no question that Julian, considering its results, thought it excellent. His reflections, however, in after life, on Eusebius of Nikomedia, who taught the boy as much Christianity as could be gathered from the fashionable semi-Arianism of the day, or on Hekebolius the sophist, whose religion varied regularly with the religion of the Emperor, were probably far different. The central point of Julian's character was his strong religious feeling. We see this in his whole subsequent history, in his essays, his letters, and his orations. To such a mind the Christianity of Constantius' court could have been little short of revolting. We cannot wonder that he turned from his Christian instructors to bury himself in the study of Homer and Plato, when we remember the kind of teaching

which an Arian of that day would give him: the minute verbal controversies, the imperfect system, deprived of all its coherence and all its vitality, the irreverent assumption that human reason is the measure of God's Nature, which would be component parts of the education given by the favourite Bishop of Constantius. A dull and uninterested apprehension of Christianity, and an eager insatiable delight in the wonderful products of Greek imagination and thought, characterized Julian at the time when he was at last allowed to leave his palace-prison at Macellum and to come to Constantinople.

At the age of nineteen Julian was receiving at Constantinople the 'training of an ordinary well-educated citizen;' but it was soon found that he knew a great deal more than his instructors, and also was becoming too prominent a character and too popular to be safe so near the Imperial throne. Learning and intelligence in a prince of the blood did, no doubt, contrast rather sharply with the qualities displayed by the Emperor; at all events, Constantius relegated Julian to Nikomedia under the charge of the versatile Hekebolius, with a strict prohibition against attending Libanius' lectures. This he ingeniously evaded by reading copies of the lectures at home. The unfortunate scholar whose duty calls him to the perusal of this typical sophist's lucubrations may well marvel, as he toils through the fluent verbiage, how any man, even a clever youth of the ordinary undergraduate age, such as Julian was at this period, could have been fascinated, convinced, and converted by Libanius. But this was the effect on Julian. Not that we can ascribe the entire result to the sophist. Leaving out of consideration Julian's previous training, the actual process of conversion from Christianity to Paganism was only begun by Libanius; it was finished by the more attractive and mysterious arts of the theurgists Ædesius and Maximus of Ephesus. If there was not a formal conspiracy between the different Neo-Platonist teachers to entrap this valuable ally, their proceedings, as recorded by their enthusiastic historian Eunapius, greatly belie them. Julian was handed on from Libanius to Ædesius, from Ædesius to Chrysanthius and Eusebius. These, while affecting to teach him the loftiest and purest wisdom, mingled with their abstract doctrines grave and mysterious warnings against the delusions of magic and the materialism of some of the professors of Neo-Platonism. This, of course, only whetted the curiosity of the eagerly superstitious youth, and when he was told that Maximus was the man whom he must avoid, because he produced wonderful manifestations, Julian not unnaturally promptly repaired to

him, telling Chrysanthius and Eusebius that they might stick to their books, but he would go on to this higher, because more tangible, wisdom. Whether this story be literally true or not, there is no need to doubt that Julian's ardent adherence to Paganism was due to the influence of Maximus, who appears to have been a charlatan of a sufficiently familiar type, with the venerable appearance and lofty earnestness that rendered plausible the rather vulgar and unworthy phenomena of the magical rites over which he presided. The sights and sounds which fascinated Julian were singularly like the manifestations of modern spiritualism, and in all probability were due to almost exactly the same causes. It is rather melancholy to contrast the undoubtedly religious and philosophical depth and purity of many of Julian's writings with the fact that it was Maximus who converted him, and who was his most revered teacher through life, and his companion in the hour of his death. For there is no doubt that Maximus' philosophy was mere magic, and Maximus' character that of a vain and greedy impostor. Julian's enthusiastic and continuous submission to him reveals the flaw in the constitution of his mind, namely, the want of judgment and common sense which made his life practically a failure.

From his absorption in these pursuits Julian was unpleasantly aroused by the sudden execution of his brother, the Cæsar Gallus, by the orders of the jealous Constantius, and his own summons to attend the Emperor at Milan. Here he was kept almost in captivity, from which he was only released by the good offices of the Empress, and allowed to fulfil his darling purpose of going to Athens in order to study there.

In the ancient University of Athens Julian attained the consummation of his philosophical and religious desires. General culture and philosophy would be stimulated and developed in him by the free intercourse and discussion with other young men, such as Basil of Cappadocia and Gregory of Nazianzum, more than by the sterile course of instruction in the formal pedantry of the lectures which were in vogue at this celebrated seat of learning. We who have spent years in the study of the art of Latin verse composition must not be too ready to throw stones at those whose attention was occupied with laying to heart¹ 'elaborate theories of literary grace;' who 'trained their ears to catch the rhythm of each sentence, and to note the significance of accent, and the varying use of anapæst or spondee at the close of every period.'

¹ Cape's *University Life in Ancient Athens*, p. 82.

Verbal analysis, 'rules of synonyms, and homonyms, and paronyms, with all the machinery of tropes and figures,' the 'stock of common places which could be turned to good account'—all this sounds strangely familiar to those who have once learned to handle their *Gradus ad Parnassum*, and to sound the mysterious depths of epithets, synonyms, and phrases. But even the most bigoted adherent of Latin verses would probably think it better not to make them the sole subject of education, and still less would he do so if they were completely useless for the purpose of learning a dead language, which is now their chief justification. Yet this is hardly an exaggerated account of the state of education at Athens during the period with which we are dealing. Mr. Cape's interesting and amusing work reveals to us the barrenness and folly of the system which was pursued there; and the wonder is that Julian should have cherished such a love for the place after his experience of its real influence. Perhaps it was because his stay there was so short; for though his religious zeal found time to be gratified by initiation in the Eleusinian mysteries, a very short time elapsed before his university life was suddenly terminated by his summons to Milan in October 355, and his elevation in the following month to the subordinate throne as Cæsar.¹

This is the important moment in Julian's life. Hitherto he had appeared as the student immersed in books and speculation; romantic, visionary, and ignorant of the world, no one in the whole Roman Empire could have seemed less fit to govern it. But his administration in Gaul, whither he was sent strictly controlled and almost guarded, showed the world that in this dreaming philosopher there was hid a vigour, activity, and perseverance that quickly triumphed over the obstacles which the Emperor's jealousy and the strength of the barbarians placed in his path. In three campaigns he 'reduced Gaul and the Rhine provinces to entire submission,' and by his vigorous administration 'secured a commanding ascendancy.' All this time his change of religion was unknown except to a few intimate friends, and he conformed outwardly to Christianity in order to avert the suspicions of Constantius, till the force of events and perhaps his own contrivance or that of his friends constituted him Augustus in 360, and in religion as well as policy he was proclaimed as the rival of Constantius. What the five years'

¹ The theory of a previous sojourn at Athens would explain the importance of the University life in Julian's history better than the few months in 355, though Mr. Rendall rejects it.—*App.* p. 287.

Cæsarship had shown was the danger in which Christianity now stood from this formidable enemy. It had shown him to be a strange combination of the philosopher, the soldier, and the ruler; and the qualities which enabled him to be thus many-sided were all subservient to a strong religious feeling which coloured and controlled his whole nature. And this feeling was completely hostile to the Christian Church.

Mr. Rendall (p. 267) well points out how bounteously Fortune accorded favours to Julian; and not the least of these favours was the death of Constantius at the moment when a collision, the result of which would have been very doubtful, between his Eâstern and Julian's Western army was impending. Julian was now sole Emperor; and from December 361 to April 363, when he invaded Persia to meet there his death, the Roman world was given over to an eager, able, and industrious ruler whose two darling objects were to beat back the barbarians and to restore and quicken the religion of the old gods. With the first object we are not here concerned; how did he succeed in the second?

The joy with which the new Augustus records the unanimity of the army, which followed his lead in religion as in war, the pride with which he enumerates the hecatombs of oxen which on the march he sacrificed to the gods, the religious tone which he gave to what we may call his election manifesto addressed to the Athenians, were sure indications of the general tendency of his reign. The result was instantaneous. All over the East the Pagans returned to their former practices. The closed temples of Greece were reopened, the priests and philosophers whom fear had silenced resumed their functions and their teaching, the people regained their shows and games, and the dishonoured gods their worshippers. It was as though the intervening Christian reigns had not occurred, and we may well believe in the feelings of expectation and pleasure with which the 'harassed interests,' the sophists, the scholars, the theurgists, and the hierophants of all descriptions regarded the undisturbed entry into Constantinople of the young hero whose reign was to be their golden age. But Julian was not content with a mere relaxation of the oppressive laws against the Pagan worship. His Christian training and his historical knowledge had taught him what a formidable power he had to contend against, and his deeply religious nature could not be satisfied with a mere rehabilitation of the old state of things, a decaying Paganism and a growing Christianity; he was bent on putting new life into the one and effectually checking the

other. The historical importance of Julian's reign consists in this, that it was not a mere reaction, an instinctive almost unconscious reaction, against the unwise haste of the first Christian Emperors, but was guided and modified by a vigorous and religious mind fully conscious of its proposed aim. On no fairer field could the powers of the old and the new religions be opposed; the ancient world with its faith met here in a last clash of conflict with the fresh life of Christianity; and short though the encounter was, it was long enough to show on which side were the forces of the coming age, and the strength that sprang from faith, and hope, and truth.

In reviewing Julian's reign two points are specially noticeable: first, the shortness of that reign; and secondly, the amount of work which he managed to compress into it. From his accession as sole Augustus to his death was scarcely eighteen months, and what he set before him, in the religious sphere alone, and partly succeeded in accomplishing, was the complete reform of Paganism, even if we cannot, with Mr. Rendall, describe it as 'a federation of all-existing cults into a Pagan Church Catholic, realizing its intellectual unity in the doctrines of Neo-Platonism, its administrative in the person of the Emperor, its head.' It would be marvellous that so short a reign should have left such an impression upon the popular mind were it not partly explained by the greatness and novelty of the change attempted. He was no ordinary apostate, nor was the reaction, as far as he was concerned, an ordinary reaction; it was an attempt at a religious revival.

Julian was far too wise to endeavour, at least at first, to suppress Christianity by force. His efforts were twofold. Primarily his object was to reform Hellenism, and it is probably just to him to assert that the rest of his religious policy was only means to this end; but as Christianity was an almost insuperable obstacle to his well-meant endeavours, he was forced to devote himself secondarily to undermining and weakening in every possible way the fabric of the Church. Both proceedings were bold and skilful, and are full of interest to us, not less because both utterly failed.

It is strange that a mind like Julian's should have seized with such accuracy upon some of the essential points which made Christianity a living power, and yet have totally missed others not less important. His appreciation of some of the peculiar qualities of the Christian faith is shown by the surest sign, namely, his attempt to transplant them into the system

of Paganism. The old religion was, before everything, a religion of mere ceremonial and show; this was its great attraction in the eyes of the populace, and the philosophical doctrines attached to it were only the fancies of a sect of students. There was, at least at this time, hardly any inner life in the religion; very little faith, and no love. This was the void which Julian tried to fill up. Not content with restoring and promoting, by personal example as well as exhortation, the splendour of the ceremonial worship of the gods, he set himself also to infuse some of the Christian spirit into the hearts of the Pagan sympathizers. He saw that the Church was wonderfully united by the power of charity, and the universal acts of kindness between believers, and he thought that his Pagan Church would, by imitating this, be likewise strengthened; so his letters to the chief priests whom he appointed and superintended contain instructions for the organization of public charity, and for the establishment of houses for the reception of strangers, even—for his observation of Christianity was in some points very exact—of those who were not Pagans. And Mr. Rendall seems inclined to believe Gregory Nazianzen's hint that 'monasteries, nunneries, and hospitals' were established. But of course little could be done with the mass of the people unless this new religion—for it was almost that—could have suitable leaders. Julian's chief imitation of Christianity, therefore, consisted in his regulations for the priests of the various temples. Some of his directions would be no unworthy model for any Christian priest to copy. His principle that 'the sacerdotal life is more honourable than the political life' must have sounded strange in the ears of the Romans, and stranger still must have been the directions to priests to abstain from reading the loose books of the comic writers, and even those philosophers whose doctrines tended towards licentiousness; to pray frequently, 'whether in public or in private, thrice a day, or at least morning and evening;' to keep themselves while 'in residence' free from all intercourse with the world, devoted only to philosophy; when not officiating, to select their society with caution, and only to visit the authorities 'in order to be of some assistance to the poor;' not to frequent but 'to leave to the populace the obscenities of the theatre,' and to dress in general soberly, but magnificently when officiating. Priests had to set an example of virtue and piety to all, and therefore they must be chosen from the most religious and virtuous men in the city, while their wives and families must also be exemplary

in conduct.¹ Mr. Rendall (p. 254) has an excellent passage on the necessary futility of this attempt at sacerdotalism. 'By simplest Pagan use a citizen was made priest in the same fashion as he was made magistrate; it was an affair of election; and his tenure and terms of office were similarly regulated.' How could such a discontinuous, casual body become a powerful and exemplary sacerdotal caste? Yet nothing less could have been of any avail in revivifying Paganism.

But Julian did not confine his efforts to the priests; he took hints from Christianity also for the improvement of the public worship. Sozomen tells us how the Emperor 'introduced into Pagan temples the order and discipline of Christianity,' and Gregory supplements this by the practice of penance and the institution of antiphonal singing. Julian's interest in the musical part of the ritual is shown by his directions to the priests to learn by heart the ritual hymns, and by a special letter directing the Prefect of Alexandria to choose boys with good voices, and to educate them in 'the sacred art of music.' In fact, a great part of Julian's religious and ecclesiastical measures seems most strangely familiar to us: this grotesque copy of Christianity teaches us, in the first place, something of the sacerdotal and ritual development of the Church in the middle of the fourth century, and secondly, how vain and illusory any external system must be without the inner life which informs and illuminates it. This Julian could not know, for he had never really seen what the true life of Christianity was. His Arian education, and his violent prejudice against the religion of Constantius, darkened his understanding, and the sneers at the worship of a dead man, with which his writings abound, show how utterly unmeaning the name of Christ must always have been to him. Ignorant of the inner life of the Church, he would be all the more inclined to rate highly the ingenuity of her mechanism and the excellence of her organization, and therefore he thought that by simply copying it, he could create an equally powerful and living Pagan Church.

But he added the force of personal example to his measures for regenerating Hellenism. Though an Emperor he remembered that he was also Pontifex Maximus, and therefore entitled to perform all the priestly functions. These he fulfilled almost, as it would seem, to the disgust, and certainly with the ridicule, of his subjects. They crowded to the

¹ See Julian's *Ep. ad Sacerd.* i. 548.

temples, not to join with fervour in the worship of the gods, but to enjoy the sight of an Emperor with his own hands performing the humble and rather revolting offices of an attendant on the sacrifices, slaying the beasts, and groping in their entrails for auguries. He was said by his sympathizer Libanius to have divided his life between the State and the altars; and, certainly, when we read how in almost every city which he visited his first care was to offer sacrifice at its famous shrines, and to go the round of its temples, we wonder how he found time, as he undoubtedly did, to transact the manifold business of the Empire. It is true Libanius is alone in his approbation of this excessive zeal for sacrificing; not only the Christians, but the calm and impartial Pagan—or at least, non-Christian—historian, Ammianus Marcellinus, openly laughs at his leader for his superstition and ‘illegitimate’ fanaticism. It is curious at the same time to notice that, though so eager and regular an observer of all the ritual of Hellenism, Julian was not superstitious in his theory of external religion, which, indeed, accorded more or less with what all enlightened Christians would probably hold at the present day. Offerings, he says,¹ made with holiness, whether they be small or great, are equal in value; without holiness they are worthless. Here he was only following Porphyry in theory; but, whereas the philosopher rejected sacrifices, images, and external symbols generally, Julian held them to be means of reminding us of the presence of the gods, adding, with what is surely great truth, that our corporeal nature renders it necessary that our worship should contain a corporeal element. This being Julian’s principle of worship, he was enabled by means of it to join with fervour in all the popular practices and ceremonies, both religious and magical. There is a pathetic interest in the numerous passages in his letters which describe the various religious observances which were his continual occupation. It is pathetic with the pathos of conviction and real earnestness; and it is pathetic, because in it he stood alone, surrounded by a mocking and unbelieving multitude. We shall utterly fail to understand Julian’s life and character unless we keep in mind the dominant motive, namely, the deep religious instinct which was displayed in nearly all his actions. It was this chiefly perhaps, though not entirely, which drove him from the fashionable Court-Christianity of his youth; it was this that made him so eager in his efforts to create a Paganism

¹ *Jul. Orat.* vii. 8; *Op. i.* p. 399.

conformed to his ideal of a philosophical religion. Not only do we see in him a firm faith in the supernatural, and a sure trust in an overruling providence, but a genuine and often-expressed love for the gods, which might frequently, with a slight change of phrase, be taken for the equivalent Christian sentiment. The prayer to the mother of the gods which Mr. Rendall quotes (p. 140) is a good instance of this. The climax of the prayer is that he may have 'a good hope for the journey that shall bring him to the gods,' because 'the chiefest element in happiness is knowledge of the gods.' And again, he declares that he 'trembles before the gods, and loves them, and worships and holds them in awe.' But we should notice that the foundation of this deep religious feeling is no superstitious credulity or unquestioning traditional acceptance, but what seems to us a lofty and pure doctrine of natural religion: 'the gods have graven laws in our hearts, by which we know without teaching of the existence of a divine being, on whom are bent our looks and our aspirations, towards whom our souls are directed as our eyes turn to the light.' It would be difficult to find nobler and more elevated statements of the relation of man to God than are contained in the writings of Julian, and especially scattered about the orations, though these for the most part are occupied with the development of a system of religion as frigid and unattractive as it was intricate and unintelligible. Mr. Rendall, we should say, gives to the details of Julian's religion greater attention than their importance warrants. Indeed, it would be difficult to say what importance they have, except as one among many illustrations of the wonderful capacity for system-making that man possesses when his reason is uncontrolled by any regard for historical truth. But the vagaries of the developed system must not blind us to the truth and beauty of the fundamental principles from which it sprang, and which, strengthened and purified by the knowledge of the Incarnate Son of God, would have made few nobler Christian heroes than the man whom the faults of the Church of his day turned into Julian the Apostate.

For this is partly the pathos of the situation, that the whole soul of the man was religious, and yet his fate made him the reviver and reformer of a system that was essentially irreligious amidst an irreligious people. In his eager reform of Paganism, Julian stood almost alone. It amused the people, and gave a fresh sensation to their versatile minds, but as for any sympathy or contagion of zeal there was absolutely none. The Emperor was applauded for the restoration

of the games and shows in which the people delighted, and which were often of a character that makes the sober and chaste Julian's share in them rather surprising; he was obeyed when he ordered people to sacrifice, because he was Emperor; but he could not command religious feeling; he could not inspire love for the gods; he could not, in short, bring to life again a dead body. In reading Julian's letters, his melancholy reflections on the decline of piety, his rebukes of the merely conventional religion which was all that he could evoke, and then his continued attempts to make all the heterogeneous fragments of Greek and Oriental legends, of scraps from the poets and selections from the oracles, of baseless philosophy and pretentious magic, into a rational religious system, there keeps ringing in our ears the phrase 'a creed outworn,' and Julian and his life and his earnestness become no longer ridiculous, but solemn and pathetic. But then, again, we find it difficult to resist laughing with the volatile Antiochenes at the picture which the poor man draws of himself rushing out from Antioch on a great festival to the shrine of Apollo at Daphne, the most celebrated in all that country, looking eagerly for the crowds of humble, devout worshippers, the smoke of countless sacrifices, and the ready gifts offered to the god, and finding, when he got there, a single priest who had brought his own sacrifice, because he could get no other, and that sacrifice, appropriately enough, a solitary goose.

What was the cause of this failure? why was Julian alone in his efforts to restore or revivify Hellenism? The answer may be given in our Lord's metaphorical words; it was an attempt to pour the new wine into old bottles. Julian brought over with him from the camp of the Christians much of their spirit, and what he had not himself got he tried to imitate. But the endeavour to pour this 'new wine,' this eager, hopeful, philanthropic and pious enthusiasm into the 'old bottles' of the Pagan creed and organization, could only have one result: the bottles must burst under the strain. And in truth we believe that Julian only succeeded in making his religion ridiculous; and, except a few theurgists and philosophers, he found no one to sympathize with his devotional feelings. Had he tried to work upon the almost undiminished Paganism of the West, had he appealed for support to the Conservative piety of Rome, he might have succeeded, though it is probable that even the Romans would have resented any attempt to make them extraordinarily devout; but in the East he found nothing but the echoes of a long vanished faith and

the fragments of a disintegrated system. The typical contest was at Antioch. Here the sentiments of the people were completely engrossed by two objects, pleasure and Christianity. Against both Julian opposed himself with all the vigorous obstinacy of his nature. The result is shown us in two remarkable historical relics: the solitary goose, which was the sole fruit of Antiochene Paganism, and the *Misopogon*, that unique satire in which the disappointed Emperor pours out his irritation against the dissoluteness and 'impiety' of the Asiatic capital.

Externally, no doubt, there was a considerable revival of Paganism, because it was to the external ceremonies, which we may call religious, but which were very often nothing but scenes of debauchery and obscenity, that the people even in the East were passionately attached. The premature suppression of these by Constantius was now producing its natural result, but Julian was too acute to confuse this reaction with the new and spiritual religious enthusiasm for which he longed. His reign was only of eighteen months' duration, but it was long enough to show that Paganism as a living faith was for ever impossible.

And all the while there stood confronting the apostate Emperor the bitterly hostile power of the Christian Church. Julian dared not, or at least would not, try active persecution. Indirect attack, bribery, cajoling, legal oppression, ridicule, internal dissensions, careful argument, were all in turn relied on to shake the faith of individual Christians and to destroy the power of the Church. But in no instance, if we except the few doubtful cases which alone survive after a critical examination of the various Christian histories and legends, did he resort to actual persecution to attain his object. What might have happened had he returned from Persia flushed with victory and irritated by the continued obstinacy of the Christians it is difficult to say; there are signs that his determination not to use violence was beginning to waver. But we may at least give him the credit of sagacity when history allows us, and history tells us of, no actual case of persecution authorized by Julian.

Undoubtedly there is a strong tradition which points out Julian's reign as the last of the persecutions to which the Church was exposed, and this tradition is not without foundation in fact. But it is clear that, in a great degree, such a tradition would naturally grow up from the mere fact of Julian's apostasy and eager Pagan sympathies; and we venture to say that what there is of truth in the tradition

beyond this is due entirely to the popular attacks on Christianity which did occur in this reign. That these were, if not encouraged, at least in many cases condoned, by Julian, is true; it is also true that the Pagan party was incited to attack the Christians by their knowledge of Julian's prejudices, and perhaps by his incautious expressions of contempt and dislike. But, as we have tried to point out, the rash and oppressive attempt to extinguish Paganism in the previous reign was a sufficient cause of the popular animosity against the Christians when the tide turned; for this animosity was displayed chiefly against those who had meddled with the popular ceremonies and their chosen haunts—the temples. Julian afforded a pretext for this by his edict that Christians should rebuild the temples they had demolished under Constantius. It was in the inquiries and trials that arose on this matter that the popular attacks on the Christians originated. When unrestrained or, perhaps, incited by a violent governor, the Pagan crowds committed many acts of brutality in reprisal. But there was no 'organized or widespread persecution,' and what there was was confined to the East. The popular tradition on the subject shows us what a force of public opinion against the Christians existed in this reign. But Mr. Rendall's patient and accurate investigation points to the true cause of this, namely, the attacks made by Christians upon the Pagan temples and ceremonies; and it reduces the so-called persecution to its due proportions. It must, however, be owned that Julian's conduct in regard to these popular outbreaks was not straightforward; and, in fact, however we may sympathize with and respect his efforts to promote and purify his own religion, we are compelled to agree with Mr. Rendall in stigmatizing much of his behaviour to the Church as 'mean.' There was in it a petty spite, an unjudicial partiality, a restless desire to worry, which reveal to us the grave faults in this mixed character. Julian's vanity and his passion for meddling will account for much that we have to reprehend in his anti-Christian legislation and personal conduct. Especially when brought into contact with that greatest of all the early Christians, perhaps of all Christians, S. Athanasius, does Julian show how inferior a great Pagan must be to a great Christian. Julian was totally incapable of seeing any good in Athanasius. He rages against him as the chief opponent to his designs in Alexandria, lavishes epithets of abuse upon him, and, as Gibbon points out, 'for his sake alone, Julian introduced an arbitrary distinction, repugnant at least to the spirit of his former declarations.' That is, he

affirmed that his edict allowing the banished bishops to return meant return to their countries, not to the occupancy of their sees. To incite the Prefect of Alexandria all the more against the great bishop, he closes a letter on the subject with the single word *διώκεσθαι*—'persecute him.' In Athanasius Julian saw the personification of the power against which his Imperial wrath and scorn were impotent; the power of the living faith in Christ as the Head of the Church. Hence his especial malignity against him. If Julian is to be considered as a persecutor of Christians and not merely of Christianity, it must be because of his conduct towards Athanasius.

But we have kept to the last the consideration of three of Julian's methods of attack upon the Church, the first of which is perhaps the one fact of his reign which is universally known. The attempt to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem seems to have been only part of a larger plan for favouring the Jews as the enemies of the Christian Church. In the letter addressed to the Jews in which he announces his intention of rebuilding Jerusalem on his return from the Persian war, he relieves them from certain oppressive charges, and asks their prayers 'to God the Ruler of the Universe' for the success of his arms. Whether he really wished to disprove one of the strongest of the external evidences of Christianity, namely, the fact of the dispersion of the Jews and the ruined state of the Temple, it is impossible to say; but there seems to be no good reason for doubting the genuineness of this epistle, and none whatever for disbelieving the fact of the attempted rebuilding of the Temple, though it must be remembered that this took place in the last six months of Julian's short reign, and was perhaps discontinued because of his death rather than in consequence of any supernatural intervention. But here again we have evidence which, if we are ever to believe history, must be credited. It may be worth while to quote the actual words of the most unimpeachable of the witnesses to the supposed miracle which interrupted the building. Ammianus Marcellinus,¹ a contemporary Pagan historian, writing obviously without a notion of any peculiar importance in the event, declares that 'whilst Alypius, assisted by the governor of the province, urged with vigour and diligence the execution of the work, horrible balls of fire breaking out near the foundations, with frequent and reiterated attacks, rendered the place, from time to time, inaccessible to the scorched and blasted workmen; and the

¹ xxiii. 1.

victorious element continuing in this manner obstinately and resolutely bent, as it were, to drive them to a distance, the undertaking was abandoned.'¹ This evidence, supported by contemporary Christian witnesses, is surely as convincing as can be fairly expected. Doubtless there is an obvious 'natural' explanation of the fact. Dr. Rode calls the occurrence an earthquake, but it seems to us that a simpler cause, and one involving less of a remarkable coincidence, would be the explosion of the foul air generated in the subterranean vaults of the Temple. This cause, suggested by M. Guizot, would account for the 'balls of fire' which Ammianus describes; but we cannot see that the explanation destroys the fact of the miracle. As Butler points out² in the case of the continued existence of the Jews as a separate people, the importance of the fact, from a religious point of view, is not the event itself, but its correspondence with prophecy. Had the Jews been enabled, by the favour of Julian, to return to Jerusalem and see their Temple restored to its former splendour, it would have been a reversal, if not of direct prophecies, at least of all the anticipations with regard to the Jews which were caused by our Lord's words and by their rejection of Him. The discovery of the means by which, in this one case, these anticipations were fulfilled, cannot, we imagine, affect our recognition of the Hand of God controlling the destiny of this remarkable people. At all events the attempt is a curious specimen of the anti-Christian policy of Julian, and of the manner in which his eager restlessness tried nearly every kind of indirect attack, however obviously futile it might be; and as such we are surprised that Mr. Rendall does not notice it.

The only direct measure with which Julian tried to beat back Christianity was the notorious edict against Christian teachers. Here we are met by a very persistent popular mistake. The earliest Christian historians began, and later writers, even the learned Tillemont,³ have perpetuated the assertion that Julian prohibited the Christian children from attending the schools. But Julian's object was to induce them to attend, in order that they might be taught the truth concerning the gods. To Julian belongs the doubtful credit of having invented the 'religious difficulty' in education. Before his time, as Mr. Rendall⁴ and Dr. Rode⁵ point out, education

¹ Gibbon's translation, vol. ii. p. 389.

² *Analogy*, pt. ii. ch. 7.

³ x. 1200. Milton also, in the *Areopagitica*, uses language which makes us suspect that he shared this mistake.—*Works*, i. 146.

⁴ p. 214.

⁵ p. 67.

had been free from religious proselytism, and was neutral territory between the contending parties. The great University of Athens had hitherto been frequented by Christian as well as Pagan students. State lecturers were chosen by popular election from among the distinguished Christian orators; and they used as text-books the Greek poems and histories and philosophies, to which Julian looked for sacred counsel and instruction. Here then he saw his opportunity; or, perhaps, in justice to him, we should say that he was anxious to remove these sacred writings from the grasp of the blasphemous teachers. His celebrated letter, which we agree with Dr. Rode¹ in taking to be an explanation of the apparently neutral law which regulated the election of teachers and lecturers, declares that, as the true religion was derived from the writings of the great Greek authors, it could not be tolerated that Christians who do not believe the religion should expound these authors. Therefore, they must either declare that Homer, Hesiod, and other authors are not false, or else cease to use them as text-books. The result of the law is that Christians must not teach literature, for Julian expressly mentions such apparently secular writers as Thukydides and Isokrates, and thus includes the whole field of Greek learning. This anticipation of M. Ferry's Clause 7 would, if carried out effectually, exclude Christians from the great privilege of elementary and University instruction; and as such it was received with a cry of rage by the Church writers, and even by the Pagans was forcibly condemned. Twice does the calm Ammianus call attention to it as an exception to Julian's general moderation, evidently regarding it as a most uncalled-for interruption to the concordat between the rival religions, which allowed the youth of both persuasions to meet in the school and lecture-room. Yet it seems a little difficult to account for the peculiar displeasure which this measure has excited. Mr. Rendall (p. 214) accurately states the considerations which make it objectionable, namely, that it was an innovation, an undue narrowing of the freedom of the Hellenic religion, and that it was aimed at a very large section of his subjects; but in his further criticism of it he seems to under-rate Julian's belief in Greek literature as a source of religious truth. Once grant that he did actually regard Homer as a religious writer, and quasi-inspired, and it is difficult to help allowing that he had some grounds for forbidding him to be

¹ p. 64. Mr. Rendall (p. 209 *n.*) overlooks Rode's alternative, viz., that it was either a general instruction or an explanation for a particular case. The former seems the most likely.

expounded by teachers who must necessarily ridicule the doctrines which they found in him. That Julian did so regard Homer there is no doubt, though his language is not uniformly respectful; and therefore it seems to us that we should, before condemning him, put ourselves in his place, and imagine our feelings, and possibly our actions, were we to hear of Voltaire giving lectures on the Bible to school children, or M. Renan appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at one of our Universities.¹

Of the third method of attack which Julian adopted against the Christians there is no need to say much, for Mr. Rendall has given a fair summary of the controversial book against Christianity which Julian was engaged in writing almost up to the moment of his death. It is interesting in two ways: first, as showing the limitations of Julian's intellect, and his utter want of sympathy with Christianity; and secondly, as anticipating many of the arguments of the Deists of the last century, and the common scoffs of the lower class of sceptics at the present day. As Mr. Rendall points out, 'large extracts from Julian's works are well suited to the *National Reformer*, and might even repay translation.' In judging this book we should remember that we only possess the fragments of it which an opponent thought fit to preserve; and the very fact that so eminent a writer as S. Cyril should have thought it necessary to answer the book so long after its author's death proves that it must have had considerable weight in the religious controversy; but it is not interesting as an intellectual study, though in so far as it shows us how much in anti-Christian literature is merely repeated from writers like Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian, it is important. What are difficulties to us were difficulties in the days of Origen and of Athanasius; why should our faith be weaker than theirs?²

All this persistent and ingenious hostility to Christianity had its effect on the lukewarm and hypocritical adherents of the Court religion, and all our authorities agree in representing the number of defections from the ranks of the Church as considerable, though not in most cases important. Time-

¹ Strauss, in his brilliant 'squib' against the King of Prussia, sees this inconsistency, and draws his own conclusions, which are, of course, unfavourable to exclusive Christian exposition of the Bible.—*Der Romantiker*, p. 40.

² The reader will find an accessible translation of Julian's fragmentary work in 'Julian's Arguments against the Christians,' by Willis Nevins, published by Williams and Norgate.

servers and double-dealers there were then, as always, and it is not to these persons that we must look when estimating the real result of this strange reign. Julian, with his religious zeal, his activity, his learning, his obstinacy, his versatile genius, at the head of a popular and inevitable reaction, represented undoubtedly a great force ; and this must have left some marks after it had passed away. The chief result of his effort, and of the popular feeling with which he worked, seems to us to be represented by the statute-book. Julian's death left religion in the Empire just as Constantine found it. As no law was passed affecting religion till the accession of Theodosius, it is clear that the result of the reaction was to nullify for twenty years, outwardly at least, the anti-Pagan legislation of Constantine and his sons. When we consider what that legislation was, and how bitterly the Pagans in the East regarded it, we shall not be inclined to underrate the effect of Julian's reign. 'Twenty years,' said Sidney Smith, 'are an eternity in politics ;' and Julian procured a cessation of religious legislation for twenty years. But the sudden violence of the attack made by Gratian and Theodosius on everything that the Pagans held sacred, the refusal of the Pontificate, the submissive tone of Symmachus and Libanius, the defenders of the old rites, testify that during those twenty years of outwardly unchanged prosperity the silent process of decay was going on in the old religion. The temper of the people must have been inclining more and more towards Christianity, and the Pagans must have seen their altars and temples more and more deserted. It is not too much to say that, but for Julian's reaction, this period of toleration would have abounded in external legislative and executive signs of the internal change that was going on ; and each of these would have caused a certain amount of friction, and would perhaps have retarded the final victory of Christianity by provoking reaction. In so far as Julian's reign taught a lesson of toleration it assisted the spread of the Church ; so far as direct persecution went it could do little to retard it. To the Pagan party in the East the death of Julian was a death-blow. The sophists and Neo-Platonists looked upon his reign as the golden age, and upon him as their last hero. After his death they sink into obscurity, only lifted at intervals to reveal them struggling against their fate in futile conspiracies and magical mummeries suppressed by the law. The defence of Paganism devolved on Rome. Julian had rejected the powerful instrument that was ready to hand in the strong, almost undiminished, Pagan sentiment of the old capital. He had chosen the weaker weapon, the literature

and philosophy of the East, and the failure of his attempt turned the hopes of the heathen party to the sacred spot, where, as Ammianus regretfully says, the ashes of the great Julian ought to lie, for there 'they might be washed by the waters of the Tiber as it flows through the Eternal City, and winds round the statues of the ancient gods.' The proper home of a Pagan ruler was in Pagan Rome, and Julian had failed partly because he had not recognized this.

But whatever weapons he fought with, whether he relied on the Conservative pride of Rome, or on the changeful philosophies of Greece, the result must have been almost the same. Julian struggled with an indomitable will, but with feeble strength, against the youthful might of a new world, and he fell before it. Mr. Rendall justly tells us that 'Christianity was at this time consciously the winning religion,' and its treatment of Julian was contemptuous and secure. Some influence his opposition certainly had upon the divisions and quarrels of the Church: in face of the unexpected enemy the Christians closed their ranks, and for a moment forgot their disputes.¹ But only for a moment; the Arian controversy was not stopped by Julian's reign; it continued all through his time, and was not less bitter after his death. Such a brief reaction could not have much effect on a contest which was a profoundly important, and perhaps necessary, moment in the historical development of the Church's life and thought; and only those writers who, like Gregory, were brought into personal contact with Julian were able to turn aside from the absorbing doctrinal discussion to oppose or to triumph over the Pagan Emperor.

Christianity was not to be stopped in its progress by any emperor, great even as Julian; and the actual results of the reaction in his reign were short-lived. A period of eighteen months, even though it summed up and expressed the secret workings of many years, could not have an enduring effect on the world's history in the face of the two vast movements which it opposed. The work of Julian's life was to drive back the barbarians and to reinstate Paganism; before fifty years had passed Alaric the Goth had encamped before Rome, and the old religion had lost for ever its priests, its wealth, and its public rites.

Thus, though we have blamed Mr. Rendall for ascribing too much to Julian's personal influence, yet we must own that

¹ Cf. Gregory Nazianzen's praise of the Arian Constantius, *Orat.* iii. 35-39, and of the Arian bishops, Mark of Arethusa and Maris of Chalcedon.—*Ib.* 82.

the error is a natural one. The interest of this period centres round this unique figure, this personality that emerges so clearly from the dim crowd of strange and unholy creatures that surround it. The vividness with which we distinguish this form and character accounts in part for the sense of the ridiculous which is unavoidable when we look at it; for we can only laugh at what we know well. But, as usual, the humour of the character lies very close to the pathos; for both humour and pathos spring from the incongruity which was manifested in Julian's life: the incongruity of a lofty ideal and noble qualities with despicable means and an unredeemed failure; and the incongruity of the two elements in his nature, which it was the misery of his epoch to be unable to harmonize, namely, his yearning for the beautiful past, and his high and eager aspiration for a pure religion. 'The pathetic destiny was that of men like Julian or Porphyry, men who were disqualified from leading the race onward into a noble future, merely because they so well knew and loved an only less noble past.'¹ Julian was made imperfect, restless, ridiculous, futile, by the unresolved discord between these two instincts in his nature, and by the isolation of his position. To whichever party he turned, he found himself alone. From the Christians he was separated by his early prejudices, by his personal defects of vanity and self-consciousness, and by his strong classical and literary sympathies; from the Pagans, whom he had to lead, and tried in vain to quicken, he was still more widely severed by his religious fervour and pure morality. He stands where the old and the new worlds meet in conflict, and is in harmony with neither. 'L'ancien monde et le monde nouveau repoussèrent Julien; l'un dans sa décrépitude eût vainement essayé de se redresser comme un jeune homme; l'autre, adolescent vigoureux, ne se put rabougir en vieillard.'²

We cannot join in the savage attacks on the memory of Julian the Apostate which it was formerly the fashion for Christian writers to make, though we hope we have indicated clearly enough the faults in his character and the causes of his failure. Still, even after fifteen hundred years, we can trace the outlines of a noble personality, obscured though it be by superstition, by vanity, by want of dignity, by affectation, and by intellectual arrogance. That this noble personality was not retained on the Church's side was, we believe, chiefly

¹ F. W. Myers on Greek Oracles.—*Hellenica*, p. 485.

² Chateaubriand.—*Études Historiques*.

owing to the faults of the Church herself and to the vices of his education; but we can never absolve Julian from the charge of a culpable misunderstanding of the forces of the world, and the clear distinction between the dead and the living, Paganism and Christianity. The religion which Julian tried to revive had been a living faith to millions, and we need not be afraid to own that it must, therefore, have had in it some truth, something to satisfy the undying wants of the human soul; but this had long vanished from it, and the failure to see this was Julian's fault. It was a fault which brought with it its own punishment, for his life was wasted in the fruitless effort to galvanize the dead body of the old faith. He might have been warned by his own oracle, or, if that story be a fable, he might have learnt the lesson from every ruined temple and shrine, every forsaken altar that he saw—

εἶπατε τῷ βασιλεῖ, χαμαὶ πέσε δαίδαλος αὐλά·
οὐκέτι Φοῖβος ἔχει καλύβαν, οὐ μάντιδα ἑάφνην,
οὐ παγὴν λαλίσσαν· ἀπέσβετο γὰρ λάλον ὕδωρ.

And we are taught by Julian's example that, though reactions are necessary factors in the world's progress, yet the attempt to infuse an artificial strength into them, to make them express anything more than the natural reluctance of man to being unduly hurried along his path, must always be, sooner or later, a failure. Whether the reaction be towards archaic religions, or Greek art, or *Renaissance* paganism, or mediæval philosophy, it must be in vain if the inspiring principle of that which it copies has departed. Julian thought to recall the vanished glories of the Greek religion, to bring back to their temples and their worshippers the splendid forms of the gods and heroes of the former faith; but the effort was foredoomed to failure, for the spiritual life was gone out of the religion, and the revived system was but a feeble reflection of the noble and gracious legends and beliefs that had made the Hellenic creed a real resting-place for the human soul:—

‘Very pale ye seem to rise,
Ghosts of Grecian deities,
Now Pan is dead.’¹

¹ E. B. Browning.

ART. III.—S. THOMAS AQUINAS.

1. *Sanctissimi Domini nostri Leonis Divina Providentia Papa XIII. Epistola Encyclica. Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum die 4 Augusti an. 1879; Pontificatus nostri anno secundo.*
2. *The Metaphysics of the School.* By THOMAS HARPER, S. J. (London: 1879.)

THE Allocutions and Encyclicals of the Popes have not, as a rule, attracted much attention in England. They are not addressed to us, and their style is ordinarily such, that we seem to be distinctly left out of the circle supposed to be interested in them. Of late years there have been exceptions, such as the Epistle of December 8, 1864, connected with the well-known *Syllabus* of Pius IX.; and the *Æterni Patris* of Leo XIII., on the restoration of 'Scholastic Philosophy,' especially that of Aquinas: the former elicited by the Political and Social state of Europe, the latter by the aspect of modern Science; the former being denunciatory, the latter in the highest degree affirmative.

No doubt the *Syllabus* had, from the Roman point of view, become urgent. Not only had the state of Italy, but the embarrassed religious position of all the nations of the Roman obedience in the continent of Europe, obliged some pronouncement from the Vatican. It was received, indeed, with a chorus of derision by the journals of the day, and was soon forgotten; but it marked henceforth so definitely the irreconcilable hostility of the religious and non-religious policies, that later utterances (such *e.g.* as the Encyclical on Marriage, or that on Divorce) have been scarcely noticed by our press; and the *Syllabus* no doubt remains the trumpet-call waiting still for its response in politics. It was superficially supposed to represent the despairing obstinacy of the Pontiff, and was ridiculed as an old-fashioned '*non possumus*,' which must practically come to an end with the prolonged pontificate of Pius IX. Even the eloquent Jesuit, F. Curci, standing almost alone indeed, gave up the cause of the 'States of the Church,' and urged the Pope to face the facts, and be 'reconciled to modern society;' but no—Pius IX. departed, and his Successor adopted, notwithstanding, in his earliest addresses to the Bishops of the Roman Catholic world (as on April 21 and December 28, 1878), the entire tone of the *Syllabus* of his predecessor; and found means to convert F. Curci too.

Scarcely less urgent has Leo XIII.'s recall to the 'Church's philosophy' been felt to be, in the presence of the Atheistic pretensions put forth (and notably at the Voltairean centenary), in the name of modern Science. If the Faith is to be effectually defended in coming times, there could be no doubt that a true philosophy and science must be ready to meet the false; and Leo has boldly appealed to the Scholasticism of the thirteenth century, as taught by its greatest master, S. Thomas Aquinas, to 'stand in the gap' and confront the enemy.

In the too usual spirit, our public writers have regarded as simply preposterous the idea of the science of the nineteenth century at all submitting to the teachings of the thirteenth. Not that our *litterati* have shown much knowledge of the thirteenth century 'Schools' of which they so easily speak. The 'leading journal,' as it is rightly called, gave a special column to the Pope's appeal to Aquinas, and rendered the 'Angelical doctor' the homage which has, since Sir James Macintosh's ethical dissertation was written, become 'good taste.' The critic even goes so far as to own, and very truly, that 'in the whole ranks of human genius, few can be named superior to him.' Yet the lively writer of this panegyric is so little acquainted with the subject, as to imagine Aquinas to have been a 'Nominalist' (!) who 'assailed a "Realism" infinitely less real than his own *Nominalism*!' ¹ Another very popular writer, Dr. Farrar, in a quotation we have seen, actually supposes Aquinas to have been a 'Franciscan!' ² These intimations give us peeps into the state of knowledge of the 'School Philosophy' among us, somewhat humiliating when we reflect that these writers are among our 'critics' and accepted teachers.

But how has the Pope's Encyclical in behalf of the great Dominican been received in the Roman communion? To say that the Papal announcement of the almost exclusive authority of Aquinas, to be maintained hereafter in the Schools of the Church, has been a surprise, is hardly sufficient. Yet there had been indications enough, in the reign of the preceding Pope, of that which was coming. Quite up to the time of Pius IX.'s death, the Jesuit writers, however, continued strongly to deprecate some fundamental points of the Thomistic philosophy, so as, if possible, to ward off the impending stroke; and it is important to an understanding of the present position, that this should, even if it seem technical, be fully

¹ *Times*, Wednesday, March 10, 1880.

² In *Saintly Workers*.

stated ; for the blow struck by the Encyclical at the teaching of some of the Religious Orders is a heavy one.

In June 1877, Monsignor Czacki, perhaps to allay some alarms, wrote, as in the Pope's name, a careful, possibly un-called-for, letter to the Rector of the University of Lille. It was an explanation of a Brief addressed to the head of the Academy of S. Thomas, instituted three years before. The Jesuit Father, Paul Bottalla, Theological Professor at Poitiers, felt himself called on to defend the philosophical position of his Order, which, while paying all respect to Aquinas, according to the original Jesuit constitutions, now differed widely from him in some points of his philosophy, and even declined certain of his theological doctrines. The Jesuits affirm, that the progress of physical science has established a number of facts which have utterly overthrown the peripatetic views as adopted by Aquinas. All the schools of Europe, except the Dominican, they say, have absolutely rejected the teaching of Aquinas—that is, really, of Aristotle—as to the ‘composition of bodies’ (for instance), being convinced that, if Science is to be cultivated at all, newly ascertained facts must be owned, and the old philosophy so far given up.

Nor is it on this ‘abstruse point’ only, as it has been called, that the authority of Aquinas was thus in question. His doctrines, *e.g.*, as to the four elements, or as to alchemy, and concerning the influence of the heavens, have been, it is said, equally set aside; and points, even involving theological inquiries much more directly, are determined by Jesuit, and not only Jesuit, writers, otherwise than by the Thomists. They mention, *e.g.*, the doctrine as to Vows and Dispensations, as to the form of Absolution, and the Consecration of the wine in the Eucharist, and some other matters of very high consequence, in which the followers of Aquinas stand nearly alone; not to refer to the graver subjects of the Immaculate Conception, and the Papal Infallibility—as to the former at least of which, Duns Scotus, the ‘subtil doctor,’ was in advance of Aquinas.

Into these subordinate opinions, of course, we do not here enter; for no doubt a more distinctive difference, as just intimated, between the Thomists or Dominicans on the one hand, and the Scotists with the Franciscans on the other (which seems to many at first sight simply philosophical, or even speculative), as to the ‘composition of bodies,’ and to what was called the ‘*Substantial Unity* of human nature,’ proves to be of primary consequence;—the Dominicans maintaining that unity in their way, and the Franciscans and the Scotists

in another. The Dominicans held that organic bodies are determined to their corporeal form by the vital power which is in them; and that hence the human body is determined by the living soul. (As to inorganic bodies, there was little controversy.) The Franciscans, though not unanimously, regarded this explanation of man's substantial unity as equivalent to a denial of the separate reality of bodies in themselves;—an extreme form of Nominalism, however, which both Scotists and Thomists had united to oppose. The difference between the two schools was found to be a far-reaching one, both in science and theology, and indeed in the whole philosophy of the universe, if men were disposed to be strictly logical. It touches, not remotely, our bodily Identity, the doctrine of the Resurrection, and even, in some aspects, the hypostatic union in the Incarnation (as implied in the Athanasian symbol). John of Damascus, long before, had apparently felt this; yet he speaks almost as in the language of Aquinas when¹ he argues that the soul of man communicates 'with the inanimate.' Here, as elsewhere, Aquinas perhaps softens the teaching of the Damascene, as to 'the composition of bodies;' though the great Eastern teacher shows what the elder doctrine of matter had been. (So, for instance, when John of Damascus had denied the material fire of hell, Aquinas interprets 'non est materialis, talis qualis apud nos.'²)

We have already then said enough to show that the Encyclical of Leo XIII., as to the revival of the Philosophy of Aquinas, could be no passing utterance, affecting as it does such numerous and practical issues, even in the Roman communion. Let us now look somewhat more closely at what the Papal Letter actually says,—speaking, we must remember, with 'infallible authority,'—for every word will be weighed on all sides.

It begins by a preamble boldly putting in the foreground that what follows comes with all 'the authority to teach' which Christ gave to His Church, and especially, it adds, to the successors of S. Peter in the see of Rome. It concedes at once, however, that the Education of the world can only really be carried on in accordance with a true philosophy and a right method; and asserts that European society has gone wrong in consequence of failure in this respect, and in various ways, through 'false philosophy.'

'Man' (says the Pope) 'is a creature of reason, so that if his mind

¹ *De Fide Ortho.* ii. 12.

² *Dist.* iv. 44, 93.

errs, his will soon follows; and Christianity is intended to rectify the errors of men's minds, and restore them to what is right. Though Religion acts on the mind through God's grace, we must not undervalue that natural reason which, not surely in vain, God has given. The light of Faith perfects indeed the light of Reason; but human knowledge must be cultivated, if the whole man is to be restored. In the first place' (says Leo XIII.), 'philosophy is a schoolmaster leading to Christ; and when rightly used it prepares for, and defends, the faith. And next, Christianity is not only a Revelation of truths to our faith, but it illuminates truths previously known, in some degree, by nature. The wise, even among the heathen, vindicated natural truths as laws written in the heart; and this is admitted by the fathers of the Church. All may see that the path of faith is thus frequently cleared. In the natural reason God is perceived through His works, His perfections in fact being evident therein; and further, Reason often harmonizes God's revealed Word, and certifies the marvels of the Gospel, showing more and more that "we have not followed cunningly devised fables."

'But more than this' (Leo XIII. boldly continues—and we gladly quote it), 'Reason contributes to uphold the entire teaching of the Church. Having the solid basis of a true philosophy, it shows our theology to be a body of consistent truth coherent in itself; it discovers to us the analogy of nature and grace, and the connexion of the mysteries of faith with the chief end of our being. Then, as truth never contradicts truth, philosophy is a defence against all resisters of truth. It does not constitute truth, but is its bulwark; it stands in the ancient ways. It receives with humility truths supernatural, which surpass the discovery of mere nature. For to adopt a conclusion opposed to Revelation we know would be to violate both Reason and Faith.

'There are those (he warns us) who so unduly exalt natural reason as to regard admission of Divine authority as slavery, and a hindrance to the attainment of truth. But this is so foolish as to imply that there are no higher truths than we already know, and that there is no growing discernment and no gift of faith. Surely our natural faculties—everyone is aware—are very limited after all; and we find that faith, when strengthened by the Divine authority, is a true teacher indeed. To join philosophy with faith is the right course. Faith illuminates reason, and increases its power; and Reason, in newly acquiring any truth, the more readily distinguishes what is false. Faith thus expands and guides the mind. Without it the wisest have erred; with it our Christian fathers have found in Christ "all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," even Him Who is "the Wisdom of God," and the Restorer of wisdom to man. Against tyrants, martyrs have defended the truth by their lives; but against falsehood, our philosophers have defended it by reason. Our apologists and theologians, from Justin and Irenæus, and many others, to Damascene in the East, and to Anselm in the West, may in this be appealed to; and after them the Scholastics, who gathered together all that the fathers had taught.

'And' (his Holiness further urges) 'our wise predecessor, Pope Sixtus V. (d. 1590) has pronounced that among the Scholastics, Aquinas and Bonaventura are pre-eminent; but we know and assert that Aquinas has the wisdom of them all. There is no part of philosophy and theology which he did not treat solidly; and, as Cajetan says, Reason can scarcely rise higher than on the wing of Aquinas, nor Faith have greater succour than by the reason he brings. Benedictines, Carmelites, Augustinians, Jesuits, and others followed his footsteps. The academies of Europe, Paris, Salamanca, Alcala, Douai, Toulouse, Louvain, Padua, Bologna, Naples, Coimbra, and others, adopted Aquinas with wonderful consent. Popes made their appeal to him, such as Clement VI., Nicolas V., Benedict XIII., Pius V., Clement XII., Urban V., Innocent XII., Benedict XIV., and Innocent VI. The last-named puts him next to inspired Scripture. They then who hold with Aquinas never deviate from truth; while his impugnors may always be suspected of error. Great Councils also agree in upholding Aquinas, and the Council of Trent placed his *Summa* on the altar, side by side with the Holy Bible. Even heretics have owned his unique power. Since the sixteenth century other systems of philosophy indeed have attracted Catholics; but as to these, while we do not here in detail condemn them, we monish the utmost care. Nor do we limit what we say to philosophy; we include theology. Reason and Revelation must go together, as in "the School." Attention has happily of late been more directed to this by the bishops, and we urge now on every one of you our desire that young theologians and philosophers be directed to Aquinas.

'The times are evil, and young men must be well armed. Nothing is more likely (save God's special grace) to recover those who profess to "follow Reason alone" than the doctrine of the Schools and the Fathers.

'Then as to Civil Society, which is now threatened, Aquinas has treated the whole subject irresistibly; the nature of liberty and government, of law and mutual duties. Or, if we turn to the arts and sciences, the philosophy we require you to restore will render invaluable help. To impute to us jealousy of physical science is the greatest injustice. Between the proved conclusions of science and the philosophy of the Schools there is no opposition. Aquinas and Albert the Great were science students, as well as philosophers. If you care then for science, restore the golden wisdom of Aquinas. Show how solid he is, in comparison with the "over subtil" scholastics, whom we do not approve.¹

'Above all, let us pray for the Divine blessing on this work, which we commit to you with our Apostolic benediction.'—(Aug. 4, 1879.)

Thus far the Pope. We can have nothing clearer. Whatever Thomism may be, in Theology or Philosophy,—and we must say something on both—this is, to use a common phrase, and so far as the opponents of Aquinas are concerned, a step

¹ Duns Scotus being called the *Subtil Doctor*.

not to be retraced—a 'breaking down the bridges, and burning the boats.' Unfortunately for the Jesuit father, P. Bottalla, almost on the eve of the promulgation of this remarkable Encyclical, he published, and afterwards defended, his tract on the 'composition of bodies,' according to the two principal systems which, as we saw, divide the Catholic schools. In this tract he speaks thus of the Thomist or Peripatetic doctrine :—

'Considered metaphysically, it rests on equivocal terms, and *petitiones principii*; considered psychologically, it gives occasion to *materialism* (!); considered from a chemical and physiological point of view, it is in plain contradiction with established facts; considered historically, it has in its psychological part been always opposed by the schools of Alexander of Hales, and Bonaventure, by Scot and the Franciscans, and by the doctors of England and of the Sorbonne. It was abandoned by the chief Catholic Schools in the seventeenth century, and was actually repudiated in the eighteenth by all but Thomists of the most rigid type; and thus it was eliminated everywhere from philosophical teaching. And finally, considered theologically, it creates insoluble difficulties in the domain of dogma, and is not in agreement with the unanimous doctrine of the Fathers of the Church on the subject of the two substances (soul and body), adequately distinct in man.'—(pp. 14, 15.)

In his defence of this statement, the learned Jesuit (p. 33) tells us of a synod under our Archbishop Peckham, which pronounced on the opinion of Aquinas as even 'heretical, and contrary to the Catholic faith,' according to the judgment of 'authorized and famous doctors,' in 1278.¹ F. Bottalla then goes so far as again to repeat, that 'almost all modern philosophers defend the system contrary to Thomism;' and declares that Aquinas 'received his doctrine from Aristotle, and not from the Fathers;'² a statement which seems to have roused the Louvain Professor M. Abbé Dupont to publish certain chapters of Dr. Schneid on 'Matter and Form,' to shew on the contrary that the Thomist doctrine *alone* is compatible with science,—which is the position taken apparently by the Pope in his Encyclical,—while the ground occupied by the Jesuits is the very opposite of this, according to F. Bottalla; and in his own support he appeals to Salmeron, who rendered

¹ *Query* 1284? We suppose the letter of Peckham to the Cardinals under Martin IV. (*Wilkins*, ii. 112) to be here referred to, in which Peckham also asserts that Aquinas held his philosophical doctrine subject to the correction of the University of Paris; a statement which rests on Peckham's authority, as Aquinas had been dead some ten years, and had been defended by the aged Albert the Great, his master, who survived him.

² *La Lettre*, &c., p. 29.

such eminent services to the Council of Trent, as declaring many of the propositions of Aquinas to be 'unsuitable to our times;' and as writing, 'if there comes a day when some Jesuit, as our Ignatius hoped, should present the theological doctrine in a new and preferable manner, let us not refuse the glory, but refer the matter to our General.' Following up this latter idea, and scarcely even 'distinguishing S. Thomas the theologian from S. Thomas the philosopher,' 'the 5th General Congregation,' in the 56th Decree, thus writes: 'We are not so bound to S. Thomas Aquinas as to think with him in everything. Both in philosophical questions and in those which belong to Scripture and the canons, we are at liberty to follow others (approved by the General of the Order, as set forth in the 22nd Constitution). The rule,' he adds, 'which has guided the Jesuits (p. 59) is to follow the progress of Science as taught in the most renowned Universities.' And again (p. 61), 'the progress of chemistry, and the rapid development of all the physical sciences, have necessarily changed the philosophy as to the nature of bodies.'

The Jesuits, we may observe, ceased to exist in the latter half of the eighteenth century, and during those forty years (that is, till they were recalled to life by Pius VII.) physical science had taken a new departure in all the Universities and Lyceums of Europe; and the philosophy of Aquinas was 'an anachronism;' all the schools of Europe rejecting it, especially as to the 'composition of bodies.' Accordingly a Congregation was called at Rome in 1820 to revise the curriculum of the Jesuit schools. Father Beckx was General of the company in 1858, and published an ordinance to carry out, as far as might be, the ideas of the 22nd Constitution; yet, they say, with 'charity and moderation,' thus leaving some freedom in philosophy. (November 1863.)

Such being the state of things, it is not possible to wonder at the anxiety of the Jesuit fathers at this crisis. We may see it not only in such writings among ourselves as Cardinal Manning's tender and reluctant preface to the gentle translation of the Pope's Encyclical, given by his approval, to the English, but also in the language of half-bewilderment adopted by his Jesuit co-adjutors. And the surprise is not limited, of course, to the Jesuits. A French edition of *S. Alphonse de Liguori* has just appeared, in twenty-eight volumes; and the translators are naturally anxious as to the effect which the Pope's requiring Aquinas to be thus taught might have on their work. The Pope condescendingly addressed them in

a special letter, three or four weeks after his Encyclical, in which, extolling the merits of their S. Alphonso, but more especially of his *moral* theology, he adds, that it is the glory of S. Alphonso, that he follows Aquinas, and praises his philosophy—as now recommended in the *Æterni Patris*. In a few weeks afterwards (October 15) his Holiness ordered a new and careful edition of the works of Aquinas to be prepared by a special commission, and wrote to the 'scientific society of Brussels' to direct their adherence to the 'doctrine of the Christian philosophy.' It is said, indeed, in the public journals that some 'new manuscripts of Aquinas' have been discovered, but it does not follow that the seal of Papal approbation has been set on all these, whatever they may be. The Pope stands firm to Aquinas as universally known.

The Encyclical is *ex cathedrâ*, as it appears in the document itself of August 4, the feast of S. Dominic, 1879; but on July 5, this present year, it was orally reiterated to all the pilgrim preachers gathered at Rome. As to the critical point of the doctrine of Aquinas 'concerning the union of soul and body,' and of 'form imparted to primary matter,' there can be no question about the meaning of Leo XIII., or even of Pius IX. 'The only safe and true philosophy is that of the Thomists,' and it is now commanded to be taught: that is, if Leo XIII. speaks, as he says, with the 'teaching authority' of the Holy See,—in a word, as the 'Head of the Church.' It may be painful for the Jesuits to bow to this, but outwardly there seems no alternative. The Pope laments that the philosophy of Aquinas has for years been 'pushed aside, and even abandoned,' but he says it shall now be fully reinstated. In the celebrated Gregorian College at Rome, the work is begun, under Cardinal de Luca, and in the Urban College, in the Pope's immediate jurisdiction.

We cannot imagine all this dignified, clear-headed, authoritative and determined direction to reconstruct the education of the Catholic world to be a vague exhortation, meaning, as some have hinted, nothing more than a 'wish' or opinion, of Leo XIII. It goes to the root of Catholic teaching, and restrains the vagaries of the future, as truly as it limits certain doctrinal interpretations of the past. As to its effect on philosophy and science, it is not possible to form any rapid judgment. The Pope, however, cannot have been lightly advised. The Jesuits, he was fully aware, had generally disbelieved in S. Thomas's philosophy, but this has not alleviated the tone of the Encyclical. Yet, as the most learned of their

journals in this country,¹ just before the Encyclical came out, admits—

'if the Holy See, or an Ecumenical Council, approved Thomism in a marked manner, that "theory" would soon be the only one taught from Catholic chairs of philosophy, the others would fall into discredit and be forgotten. And one of the first consequences we may venture to surmise would be this, that modern physics and modern chemistry as now cultivated among us would prove a source of *continual embarrassment* to men who by their calling were scientific, but who yet desired to show all reverence to faith and authority. One can even *imagine* that such perilous studies would be given up, and that a widespread decay of physical knowledge would set in. . . . The Jesuit fathers have mostly disbelieved in Thomism, and they are and have been the chief Catholic students in what are known emphatically as modern sciences; while the school which has grown up devout to mediæval physics has made no reputation in this domain. Now a barren theory in physics is, on the face of it, a false theory. Did Thomism hold the secret of nature, it would long since have bestowed on us the sovereignty of nature.'

There is so much of unfortunate audacity in all this, that we are at a loss to guess whether it was meant as an *argumentum ad impossibile*, or a defiance of consequences. It seems to say, that it is conceivable that Catholics may break with the laws of nature, and give up the study of physics, in obedience to 'the Holy See.' The writer strikes out so wildly, that while Father Bottalla charges Thomism with 'materialism,' his reviewer, a little further on, conceives that Aquinas may deny the '*reality of matter*' (p. 513). What is so strongly deprecated has, however, come to pass. The *Æterni Patris* lays down the rule for Catholic philosophy, as well as theology; and, as we have said, the Jesuits have really nothing to do for the time, but to submit.

It is, indeed, as if guarding against possible catastrophe, that M. Bottalla's reviewer afterwards hints that 'a *certain interpretation* of Thomism may be conceived to agree with science;' but M. Bottalla's tract has not facilitated such interpretation. Contrasting, in some detail, the Thomists' doctrine of the 'composition of bodies' with that of modern science, he takes 'water' as an example, and says that it is 'l'oxygène et l'hydrogène combinés dans les proportions de 88 à 11'—(forgetting that '*je ne sais quoi*,' which Professor Huxley owns to be necessary, which might have made him more careful in the assertion which follows); '*les forces de deux composants restent identiques dans le composé*;' and he

¹ *Dublin Review*, April 1878.

makes the exaggerated statement, side by side with this, that Thomism obliges us to say that '*les formes substantielles de l'oxygène et de l'hydrogène cessent entièrement*,' on water coming into being. Not content, however, with this, M. Bottalla touches on points of theology also, such as the 'condition of the bodies of saints after death,' and that 'of our Lord's Body at His resurrection,' and of His Sacramental Body, &c., in order to show the incompatibility of Thomism with commonly approved views.

No doubt a real difficulty of the physical doctrine of Aquinas (as we shall see) lies in this, that it seems to make 'matter' a *possibility* only, and without reality, previous to its acquiring 'substantial form.' But even this would not reduce *materia prima* to nothing, for there would still remain an *aptitude* for receiving 'form,' which is something; and it is perhaps as much as the *attenuated ether* of Professor Balfour Stewart and others would imply. At all events, to treat Thomism thus will indeed (as the Ultramontane reviewer feels) be creating a 'source of continual embarrassment to Catholic men of science.' The issue, scientifically, of the appeal made without doubt by the Encyclical of the Pope must now not be treated in this temper, but it must be calmly waited for.

In dwelling, as we have thus far done, so exclusively on the Papal assertion of the philosophy of Aquinas, and on the Jesuit surprise, it is not that we are unmindful of what the *Æterni Patris* says of the work of reason in building up a 'coherent theology,' and of the security of following Aquinas therein. We somewhat abstain, because of the conviction that it would be impossible to enter here on a subject so large. The least sketch, for instance, of the contents and arrangements of the *Summa Theologiæ* would need a very considerable pamphlet, rather than a brief notice like the present. To exhibit only its *conclusions* as a whole—a work which ought to be done in the interest of our Christianity, which is now so often known but in a mutilated way—would alone give any idea of its completeness, and of what we may call its finish, as an intellectual vision full of beauty. While we should demur, indeed, to details not unfrequently, and ask some reconsideration of points left free, *e.g.* in the Damascene, and Peter Lombard, and the Fathers (and feel that it is a 'coherent theology' without those details), we should see an argument for Christian truth itself quite irresistible in that grand and orderly survey of God's nature and goodness, the Duty of man, the Incarnation of the Son of God, and the

grace of the New Creation,—branching out into well-nigh every region of philosophical and Christian inquiry. But we must pursue the practicable. Having in view the main purpose of the Encyclical—the restoration of the Catholic philosophy as taught by Aquinas, a philosophy confessedly based on the writings of a heathen thinker, who lived in the palmiest days of Athens, the disciple of Plato, the contemporary of Demosthenes, the teacher of the Macedonian conqueror—we must keep to, and even yet more fully consider, what the Pope's appeal is.

The phenomenon itself, however contemplated, is such as ought to be pondered: that, in the present (may we not say, in one sense, critical?) condition of our religion in all Christendom, the asserted 'Vicar of Christ' is directing attention, not to a fresh proclamation of infallible truths by himself, but to a school theologian, who died six hundred years ago: a schoolman whose whole philosophical teaching is, confessedly, that of a Greek who lived three or four hundred years before Christ was known. By what means has it come to pass that Aristotle is thus declared to be the educator of the thoughtful Christian? Surely, were we to go no further, it is a striking testimony to the intellectual and ethical unity of that human nature which our Lord assumed, and which He came to restore and save. The laws of thought and the foundations of truth are the same always for man.

The primitive Church, in its simplicity, taking to the letter S. Paul's warning against being 'spoiled by philosophy' (as if it prohibited all strict thinking), sometimes forgot that he said also, 'we speak *wisdom* among them that are perfect.' 'What *think* ye of Christ?' was also the first problem suggested by our Lord Himself, and it set the mind of the Church 'thinking' for ages, in order to express itself fully as to the primary and fundamental truth, His Divinity. The Gnostics, already in the field, here forced inquiry into the possible connexion of the Divine and human; the relations of the self-existent ONE with the many and mutable; the point of contact between the temporal and Eternal. Ethical questions were not yet in debate. Yet the dread of 'human philosophizing' long lingered among Christians, and as late as S. Gregory the Great the literature of Greece and Rome was suspected as evil. The mingled opinions, however, of the Alexandrian schools compelled, in self-defence, some recourse to philosophy among Christians; and Justin, Athenagoras, Pantænus, Clement, and Origen, in succession were philosophic Christians. A school of Platonists quickly arose; and

Platonism was the Church's philosophy even to the days of S. Augustine, and was cherished by John Scot Erigena so late as the ninth century. The writings of Aristotle were studied, however, chiefly in translations among Christians, as well as among most Eclectics, from the time of Plotinus, Porphyry, and Iamblicus, till the edict of Justinian (529); while some Schools readily mingled the two philosophies—(a fact not surprising, indeed, since Aristotle as well as Plato had been known in Alexandria as far back as the Ptolemies).

The history of the writings of Aristotle seems, especially in this connexion, quite worth noting, as there might appear a kind of Providence in it. Aristotle's school continued, after his death, at Athens; but the teaching of his successors must have depended only on oral tradition; for his voluminous writings were hidden, and as if lost, for more than a hundred years after Theophrastus, his successor. They passed by purchase to private hands, eventually, however, coming back to Athens and, falling to Sulla at the taking of that city, were brought to Rome (B.C. 86). These were, strange as it looks, the writings which were to influence the thought of the world in remotest time. By these Christianity itself would, like S. Paul, teach the advancing intellect of men as from the Areopagus.

Our Religion came, we know, in the 'fulness of the times,' at an era when the 'way had been prepared.' It announced truly the 'Kingdom of God,' a 'Reign of righteousness,' and apostolic 'Thrones;'—but the Jewish polity furnished its Social rule, and the Roman law, at least from Hadrian, its Political protection, and the Greek intellect its instrument of higher Education, its 'schoolmaster to Christ,'—from Tarsus to the ends of the earth.' At the fall of the Empire of the West, barbarism for a while arrested the mental progress which was becoming so hopeful for Christianity, but we see in such as Boëthius how Greek philosophy, even at the worst, was not suffered to fail us. Even the rise of Mahometanism in the seventh century strangely also brought with it (as if in reversal of Justinian's edict) the revival of this philosophy. Damascus, Aleppo, Balkh, Ispahan, Samarcand, Cairo, proved to be *foci* of this learning. The Nestorians of the East had even used it in opposing orthodoxy; and they next combined with Mahometanism at Bagdat in propagating it. The great Oriental Father, John of Damascus, adopted its language to some extent, and practically, though indirectly, extricated the East from the confusion incidental to the transference of Greek terms to the less perfect Latin equivalents, which had

once startled S. Jerome. Schools of translators from the Greek into Arabic, in the next generation, were founded by Haroun al Raschid; at the time Charles the Great was beginning to educate the West. It was all very wonderful—(as regarded providentially).

The barbarous period which lies between Boëthius (who translated part of the *Organon*, &c.) and Alcuin extinguished most of the episcopal and monastic schools of the West; except in remote seclusions (as, for example, in Britain, at York, Lindisfarne, and Iona, &c.). These schools in some degree bridged over the hiatus. But after Alcuin and his successful palace-schools, and Rabanus, and John Scot Erigena, his successors, the light was to be extinguished no more. From Erigena to Abelard—subdued by S. Bernard—and onward to Anselm and the Master of the Sentences, there is a steady advance, though with varying fortune. The course of conquest, too, which took Mahometanism into Spain, served the purpose of promoting intellectual intercourse with Jews, like Maimonides (1131-1204), the 'Second Moses,' and with Christians, like Albert the Great (1193-1278). Cordova produced the most eminent of the Arab teachers, Avempace (1095), Avicenna (980-1037), and Averröes (1120); as well as the Hebrew 'Maimonides.' Albert the Great draws largely from Avicenna, and adopts his manner; and Aquinas is found the effectual opponent of the followers of Averröes; and Avempace is said to have been the teacher of Avicenna. In the midst of these struggles of philosophy, Aristotle finally fastened his hold on the mind of Europe: for the Spanish Arabs were his devout admirers; and thus the method as well as the philosophy which give such clearness to the *Summa Theologiæ* are marvellously traceable to sources unconscious of the work to which they contributed so much. Other causes, also, now placed in the hands of the Christian Schools the Greek originals of Aristotle's works; as, for example, the Latin conquest of Constantinople (1204).

We must not, however, forget that Christian truth could meanwhile very practically advance without this philosophy, great as it was. While the philosopher-saints were being led to prepare the education of the future; the missionary-saints, like Francis of Assisi and Dominic, had been, in their ardent way of love and humility, personally advancing the Gospel among the nations. Aquinas was born when Dominic died (1226); and Francis had only just gone before.

Of the Scholastic struggles and alternate triumphs of Nominalism and Realism, from Erigena to Abelard, this is

scarcely the place to speak. But we must not be wholly silent ; lest we seem to avoid what is essential to our subject. After the days of Aquinas, his philosophy in the main long held sway. At the revival of letters there was some assertion of a modified Platonism, aided by the dislike of Thomism naturally entertained by Luther and other Reformers. The philosophy of Aquinas was at times in disfavour even in the Roman Church ; but, as we have seen, it is now declared by the reigning Pope to be the truth, and the education of the Roman community is to be guided by it in times to come.

Some short and simple explanation of the grounds of that Scholastic philosophy seems therefore to be due ; and at the risk of being wearisome to not a few of our readers, we must glance at this before we conclude our present task ; only premising that we endeavour to avoid technicalities as much as possible, and render the meaning of the Philosophy into the language of common thought. If people are to comprehend the recall to the Scholastic philosophy—whether they approve it or not—it must in our days be put before them, at first, in connexion with the facts and realities of human existence. It is a mistake to fancy that the highest truths, *e.g.* the ethical, will all fall into dialectical ‘form,’ and ‘figure.’ If, indeed, it were possible to revive the old dialectical *affirmo, nego, distinguo*, and *respondeo*, &c., it would surely lead to that mental play with great subjects which some of the most earnest of mediæval thinkers deplored. The Logic of the Schools we cannot indeed well refer to here. The underflow of right reason, which is the natural logic with which all men begin, must be our preliminary trust. It soon detects that vagueness which is the disguised feebleness of what is ridiculously called ‘broad thought,’ but is in reality a ‘broad way that leadeth to destruction’ of all true thinking.

We should be glad if we could avail ourselves here of the elaborate and meritorious work of ‘Father Harper, S.J.,’ the first part of which lies before us ; but with all its painstaking, it certainly does not help thus far to popularize the theology of the School. It might rather deter the modern English thinker from attempting the subject ; and the Introduction, which is meant to clear the ground and win a hearing, is so inferior in tone, style, and illustration to the book itself—if judged from the first volume—that it will do harm, it may be feared, rather than good, to the cause Father Harper has in hand.

The subject-matter of Science and of Philosophy, we must

remember, is the same. It is the business of science to gather together the *facts of being*, analyse them and arrange them; while philosophy has to search the 'reason why.' If a Divine Revelation be found among the facts around us, it has its place in some department of true Science, and is also to be dealt with by Philosophy. All this is stated in the Encyclical in terms which ought, by their clearness and straightforwardness, to satisfy, so far, every competent thinker. The problem of the universe was before Aristotle, as well as before Huxley. To speak disparagingly of Aristotle's treatment of the problem in comparison of the modern is to betray worse than ignorance. Aristotle was for ages the greatest of physicists; and he is now, at this time, *de facto* the most influential of philosophers.

The intense debates of Scholasticism could not for centuries have engrossed the mind of advancing Europe, as they did, unless the most vital truths had been involved. In the exciting inquiries of Nominalism and Realism, Truth, Goodness, Justice, Reality in Ethics and Religion, all were at stake. Christianity, to those who accepted it, implied a philosophy of the universe. The universe of things was seen by all to consist of two great classes of being, the permanent and the changeable: the permanent exist, and we expect them to exist, as always the same; the changeable are phenomena which come and go. Intelligence is permanent being; its essence and laws abide. Life is permanent being; it is real. Phenomena acquire existence of a temporary kind, by the union of matter and form, through the action of life, or of mind. Permanent being, it was observed, acts most frequently, if not always, from the invisible; and permanent being must precede the phenomenal.

The action of the permanent on the phenomenal in the universe, and the principle and laws of that action, is, in modern language, the great subject of the Scholastic Philosophy.

In the main, this subject was treated in two ways: in each way dealing with 'abstract ideas,' no doubt, yet both as implying practicable consequences. According to Aristotle, these abstract ideas are *individual results* of mental action; according to Plato, they are substantially in *mind as such*. With Aristotle, all abstract ideas are the abstractions of our experience—both the absolute, and collective experiences. With Plato, the highest ideas absolutely exist in the highest intelligence; and all intelligences, according to their degree and capacity, are in relation with the Supreme Absolute, so that without this relation they would cease to be intelligences. The former doctrine was, by its opponents, believed to destroy

the oneness of truth and thought ; and the latter was regarded as essential to morals and religion, true alike for all. The morality of Aristotle, for example, was a practical mean between extremes ascertained by individual experience. The morality of Plato might be described as an instinct of the perfect and beautiful. Neither of these philosophies consistently carried out its theories so as to exclude the other ; hence the controversies of thoughtful men, watching the bearing of these opposing doctrines on the Ethics and Christianity of the world.

In the examination of these relations of the permanent and the phenomenal, the doctrine of Causation naturally came under review. Whether *potentia*, or power *un-put-forth*, could be conceived to exist in the Perfect Being ? was an inquiry not to be avoided ; and Aquinas carefully confronts it by his *Purus Actus*. There is no equivocating, no hair-splitting here ; nor in the cognate inquiry, ' *utrum sit scientia in Deo*,' according to the human conception of *scientia*.¹

Creation and Causation are thus the battle-ground of both Science and Ethics. Believing, as the Schoolmen did, in Creation as a Divine act,² they had at once to deal with the omission of that idea in Aristotle, and his assumption of the Eternity both of mind and matter—an assumption equally made by Plato. The doctrine, that matter was but a ' *possible being* ' until it received ' *substantial form* ' was here an assistance. Intelligence is next regarded as the light which illuminates, and gives ' *substantial form* ' to primæval matter, previously without ' *form and void*.' This seemed to alleviate, but not remove the difficulty. All the facts of the physical universe, and of our own experience, were, no doubt, to Aristotle quite real ; but intelligence was real in one sense, and unformed matter in another. Aquinas thought it necessary, therefore, to write against the ' *eternity of the world*,' and cleared himself at least from that possible inference of his philosophy by his ' *Law of Continuity*,' as we may term it.

The doctrine as to the ' *composition of bodies* ' in this philosophy of the universe was the same, fundamentally, whether the bodies were organic or inorganic. This was next to be considered. In some bodies there was vitality, in some not ; and the vitality escaped scientific analysis. But the fact of simple motion, and the specific character of certain motions,

¹ When Bacon and Hobbes despise these ' *subtilities*,' it is because the former had adopted Predestinarianism as his creed (see his *Confession of Faith*), and the latter Fatalism.

² See also *The Unseen Universe*, 4th ed. p. 269.

implied a range of facts of an invisible order. The phenomenal world was real, but was not the pre-phenomenal, or supra-phenomenal, more so, rather than less? The intelligent mover (or, as we should sometimes say, the 'ego'), and even the unintelligent mover, would naturally be foremost among realities. So far we follow Aquinas.

We may find it will bring this subject home to us, if we here pause to see how it may be expressed by modern science. Professor Tyndall, in his well-known address as President of the Birmingham and Midland Institute, very amply acknowledges the undiscovered, or even undiscoverable, set of facts 'which emerge' as quite real, at the close of physical analysis.

'We can present,' he says, 'no picture of the process whereby consciousness emerges, either as a necessary link, or as an accidental by-product, of a certain series of actions; yet it certainly does emerge. . . . We are here, in fact, upon the boundary line of our intellectual powers, where the ordinary canons of science fail to extricate us from our difficulties. . . . If you are content to make your soul a poetic rendering of a phenomenon which refuses the yoke of ordinary mechanical laws, I for one do not object. . . .'

There are facts then which can be analysed, and there are facts, it would seem, beyond analysis. There is in 'protoplasm,' *e.g.*, as Professor Huxley calls it, no life; and yet life exists. His 'deep-life' (*bathybios*) has, we believe, been given up; but, we repeat, life exists. Whether matter without mind has more than possible existence, depends on the sense in which words are employed. Probably the relation of the Modern 'force and fact' is much the same as that of the Scholastic 'power and act.' Man is—so Lichtenberg is quoted by Tyndall as saying—a 'restless Cause-seeking animal.' It is the doctrine, again, of Aquinas.

We conduct our whole course of action in this world on the idea that there are Causes and co-causes of things; and we cannot deny, without unreason, that which is in fact the hypothesis of our whole existence. Our physicists, as well as moralists, are reluctantly, but inevitably arriving at the Thomist doctrines, as to 'power and act,' 'possibility and reality,' 'the phenomenal and the pre-phenomenal.' Some ontology will come at last; for science of the phenomenal absolutely requires a philosophy of the pre-phenomenal. Here we may pause.

The scientific explanation of much of the Christian theology *ab initio* depends evidently on this philosophy. We must conceive, *e.g.*, of Creation—and also of the New Creation—as the act of a Supreme Intelligence; meaning, by Creation,

initiating entirely, and not employing materials, a simple projection from Himself, 'according to the purpose of His own Will.' Of course, in the fullest sense, this Creating can only be wrought by the Supreme. Perhaps the ground of deepest difference between Aquinas and other schools lies in this: that he has here avoided the stumbling-block of 'two Eternal principles,' to which they who differ from him are more or less exposed. All intelligences are Causes, but with Aquinas there could not be more than One SUPREME: others are finite. We cannot, without a contradiction, imagine numerous finite intelligences in the eternal past. This has to be thought out. We know that an Intelligence loses not any of his essence when he projects thought, or wills action; and so the Supreme Intelligence creates without imparting a portion of His Essence, and not (as some of the schools have said) by way of Emanation. Here we stand on the threshold of thought.

We thus briefly introduce the Philosophy of the past in the person of Aquinas, his credentials being guaranteed by Leo XIII., to the Science of the present and the Theology of the future. They will make their own terms eventually. We do not anticipate much immediate result among ourselves. We have lost so much of true insight, since Locke; but it must return. Truth cannot be always ignored. The influence of this Philosophy will be felt in the Roman communion chiefly, for some time to come. If, however, the clergy of either communion in this country could be brought to study Father Harper's book, we should augur well for a sounder theology even in the next generation. But this book is not easy reading. The chapter on 'Possible Power,' for example, or latent *Potentia*, might help men so to conceive of existence in the Eternal, as to undermine both the Calvinism and the Molinism, which have so debased the conception of the Divine Prescience among English thinkers.

Countless subjects of solemn interest crowd upon our thoughts, stirred by this philosophy—as to man's substantial Unity and Permanence—as to moral Causation—'and then the doctrine of Grace;'—the state of Nature moving on at times, in its manifold grooves, and diverging at last into the state of Glory in the New Creation.

But we have reached our assigned limits.

ART. IV.—CHRISTIAN IMAGINATIONS OF HEAVEN.

1. *The Purgatory of Dante.* By A. J. BUTLER. (London, 1880.)
2. *The Archæology of Rome.* Mosaic Pictures. By J. H. PARKER. (1876.)
3. *Ciampini's Vetera Monimenta.* (Rome, 1690-99.)
4. *Spiritual Theory of another Life.* Essay in *Contemporary Review*, vol. xvii.
5. *Val d'Arno.* Lectures by Professor RUSKIN. (1875.)
6. *Tintoret and Michael Angelo.* (1872.)

AT an earlier or later period in the decline of life, the 'private speculative individual,' as Mr. Carlyle calls some of us, may or may not begin to consider his personal prospects in the future. He will probably do so with a degree of attention directly and not inversely proportioned to the trouble he may have taken about them before. We have not observed, in the course of a certain experience, that the approach of death makes anybody clearer about what is on the other side of it; or that those who have neglected the subject through life are at all drawn to it in their latter days. The subject has its terrors, and the best people certainly do not feel them least. The children of this world seem to be wiser than ever in this particular generation of theirs; they never were so well contented not to look beyond it, and never so well satisfied with their sufficient reason, that they cannot see. The other world is like the Spanish fleet to them: they cannot see it because it is not yet in sight. Meanwhile there is plenty to look at here; and if, in any survey of their own share in their own world, they come in contact with things which seem to have relations with the unseen, they only treat such things as so far tainted with unreality. They often take refuge in laudable industries of work or science; sometimes in more dubious pursuits; as in the study of the fine arts, for instance, with equivocal purpose, and the postulate of doing what they think pleasant as they think right. They claim to be as effective, and more comfortable and better informed than sad people convinced of sin and its wide work. But even they are not immortal. The world has to be left somehow; and to ignore the fact is like the recklessness of the half-taught horseman, who gallops wavering across a field between pleasure and fright,

without knowing where or how he will get out of it ; or how to face, or what is on the other side of, the inevitable boundary fence which looms before him.

Those who do not accept the Christian Faith (at least as the best attainable hypothesis of things as we find them) cannot be expected to accept its suggestions and forecasts of things which we have not yet found. Those who protest against the human imagination altogether as a means of attaining truth, will not, *à fortiori*, care for the Christian imagination—of Heaven or anything else. We think they are bound in reason to give some account of this intrusive faculty of speculative forecast, because it is in us ; and they say they are not so bound, because it is not in them. It is, at all events, against them, and a disturbing element to negative eschatology. The natural man expects something after death, and not nothing ; and his gifts vaticinate to him. Agnosticism at least knows its enemies, and Mr. Saunders was quite right when he observed that poetry and the imagination have always been the handmaids of superstition. We have often enough said so of Art, in our own sense. The only work which the agnostic renaissance can find for the imagination is sensuality ; it is the Bathos on whose edge poets and painters best enjoy disporting themselves, having no higher thing to look to.

Strongly objecting to this use of imagination, and feeling convinced that it is not the only one, we should like to give some short account or classification of certain definite hopes and expectations, by which Christians have endeavoured at various times to realize or symbolize to themselves the Heaven they have all along hoped for, and will by no means give up. This may be illustrated both from poetry and graphic art, as well as from directly theological sources. The mind of Dante mastered and contained the theology and the arts of his age alike, and his Divine Comedy must ever stand first in the list of all non-apostolic works of the Christian Imagination. But, for the arrangement of our own part of the subject, the following considerations seem convenient.

First, all speculations on these unknown realities are made either by a positive or a negative way. Data for the former are found in Holy Scripture, partly by symbolic description of facts, partly by passages like the Beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount ; which suggest the possibility that certain present capabilities of man may be infinitely developed for his future condition of blessedness. The negative method involves the dark relief of pain, present and future, experienced, or in description, or in dread anticipation.

Secondly, it seems to require attentive consideration, that all descriptions of this mysterious state or condition, when conveyed to us through human thought and language, are in fact and by their very nature symbolic and not literal. That this state exists, and that it contains certain things described in the Apocalypse and elsewhere, we believe; that we shall exist in it, we hope: but whether its phenomena (so to speak) will then present themselves to us literally as described, we do not know. This involves the further consideration that, thirdly, all earnest speculation as to what Heaven shall be like, or be to us (and such thoughts should be indulged in gravely and according to data, or not at all, which latter alternative is practically impossible), must be personal and individual. The Christian imagination of Heaven always practically means some Christian's imagination of himself in Heaven; better or worse prepared as he may be to dwell on such a subject. The reason generalizes; the imagination, say Mansel and Hamilton, always individualizes. These kindred points, that all descriptions are symbolic, all private interpretations of them conjectural, and all practical meditations on them in this sense personal, lead to the consideration of false views of our expectations about Heaven, or the state of happiness which we expect. These are often described by non-believers as more literal in detail, and more foolish, than they really are.

I. As to the positive and the negative way of approaching the subject. Dean Milman says,¹ commenting on his beautiful quotation from Richard of Hampole, that the negative is the only true method of meditation. We shall be pure of sin and the conscience of sin, from pain and memory of pain, from loss or sense of loss. The whole hopes of the world in this kind are best summed up in the words, 'And there shall be no more Curse.' It will always be found difficult to dwell on the state of the Blessed only, for whom is no more curse. Holbein determinately does so in the 'Dance of Death'; Dürer inclines to do so; the Early Church, at all events, did so in all her graphic and sculptural art for the first 500 years, and probably for nearly 1,000. A picture of absolute happiness is like a picture without shade; and, in fact, Angelico tries to substitute colour for shade in his *Paradise*. But we know more of sorrow than joy, of evil and indignation than of good and delight in goodness; so that it is easier to give effective description of Hell than of Heaven; and a hundred read

¹ *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, vol. ix.

Dante's *Inferno* for ten who can get through the *Paradise*. Nevertheless the soul of man is taught to muse on fulness of joy and pleasure for evermore, and on expressions of that sort; holding that they express reality by symbol or analogy. It is hard to eradicate from the human spirit the notion that these words mean something.

II. And perhaps the best materials the constructive imagination can use may be found (after the beginning and end of the Apocalypse) in reflection on the Beatitudes. To see God, to obtain mercy, to be comforted, to be called the children of God by Him, in the beatific Presence; to be filled with righteousness: these words convey positive ideas as well as negative. To be comforted, for example, means not only to be cured of immediate sorrow, but to have inexpressible pleasure in God's actually and personally comforting us. The whole passages in Matt. v. and Luke vi. 20 may amount to descriptions of perfect spiritual happiness; and an impartial observer might think such Christian conjecture both loftier and more subtle than any other Heaven or heavenly state he knew of, whether Hindu, Greek, or Mohammedan. By an impartial observer, we do not mean a person who impartially denies every spiritual phenomenon as real. One may suppose a person partly instructed about the Christian Faith, not yet embracing it or embraced by it, but who has in fact neither seen nor hated, nor been trained on the Hume and Gibbon principle of perpetual effort to be contemptuous.

Now there is no doubt that, as in Our Lord's own words 'Depart ye Cursed' are set against 'Come ye Blessed,' and everlasting punishment against the kingdom prepared from the beginning of the world, so all Christian Churches have always set thoughts of Hell over against thoughts of Heaven. But they have done it with varying emphasis. So it is, that threats or deliberate imaginations of Hell have been left to individual Fathers. The well-known passage from Tertullian has lately been brought once more from the anti-Christian arsenal of Gibbon's fifteenth chapter, and must go for what it is worth against the Faith. But we are not bound to treat every passage in Tertullian's works practically as Holy Scripture, or as equal in authority to the decrees of an Œcumenical Council. As a falsetto of righteous but extreme wrath against extreme wrong, and within memory of savage persecution, this passage may be in part excused. But it is not the voice of the Church, and has not, in fact, anything to do with our subject. The martyrs died in hope, and the Church, in fact, lives in hope, that the faithful will be saved; not that any

special class of persons will be damned. Men endured the cross, and the lions, and fire, and the red-hot seat, because they believed in an unknown Heaven for themselves; not because they were in heart devising as curious torments for their murderers. The earlier creeds set forth the Life everlasting, and do not set forth the everlasting Fire, though no Christian of their day, as far as we know, dared deny it. There is a reticence; and it is certainly observable in the popular symbolic ornamentation used by the Primitive Church as distinguished from later Mediæval work. The eternal punishment of their enemies was not, as Gibbon insinuates, the habitual meditation of devout poor people in danger of being burnt *sub dio*. Such an article was not added to any early creed as a doctrine full of comfort which the faithful desired to believe. The thought of Future Punishment in some signal form belongs to all religions, and is a corollary of all moral systems; it is the indefinite outcry of the human soul for vengeance without measure, when it sees no measure of wrong. However, certain it is that, though the Presence of the Lord in Glory with saints is very early represented, both in sepulchral decoration, and in the larger Basilicas, and though He is in about 400 years surrounded by the mystic splendours of the Apocalypse, there is no contrasted Inferno that we know of for twice that time: and its introduction is an archæological or artistic landmark for the entrance of Church History on its Mediæval stage. No 'painted Hell' existed that we know of earlier than the eleventh or twelfth-century mosaics of Torcello; nor is any such representation on record, except the painting which Methodius is said to have executed to stimulate the emotional æstheticism of a certain King Bogoris of Bulgaria. But at whatever time men ceased to separate the ideas of Eternal Happiness from the dark relief of Eternal Pain, they had introduced the latter by the date of the early Venetian mosaics. Florence repeated the lesson in S. Giovanni, and the illuminated service-books soon carried it all over the world. A few words on Dante and Giotto, Angelico and Orcagna, as to their positive conception of Heaven—as far as they give us any—may illustrate the higher Mediæval ideal; and the Infernos may be treated, as of old, as a subject which Faith is forbidden to deny, and Imagination is not commanded to touch on.

Dante and Giotto were near friends; but their treatment of this great subject is so far different that Giotto casts no personal or political enemy into Hell, though his Paradise in the Bargello at Florence contains so many portraits of hostile Bianchi and Neri finally in bliss and reconciled. This frank

personification, with its expressed hope of a peace which certainly must have been far beyond all Florentine understanding at the time, is characteristic of the great religious humourist and naturalist of Italy. Real or fancied portraits of saints may date from the fourth-century sarcophagi, and Giotto has very early precedent for his Paradise: but he puts in it men yet living whom he knew personally, without anticipating the second death for his, or his party's, enemies. Perhaps the successful painter, born a shepherd below the storm of family hostility, had neither foes nor faction; but it was very different with Dante and Orcagna.¹ Giotto is far nearer the earlier mosaics of Rome and Ravenna than they; and even the *Infernos* of the later Venetian and Florentine inlayings are without any personal condemnations. But Dante, like Moses, spareth none and knoweth not to have mercy; and very much the same tone is observable in the Pisan frescoes. Angelico does not specify the lost, but with natural tenderness fills his place of rest with homely faces of well-remembered Dominicans. Still, all these painters are faithful to the early symbolic treatment, founded on Apocalyptic imagery, and not extinct till the later Cinque Cento. It ends, in fact, with Michael Angelo; but the effect of his life on sacred art has nothing to do with this paper.² Nevertheless, he undoubtedly followed Orcagna's traditional arrangement in his composition of the Sistine Judgment. On one particular detail let us hear Professor Ruskin:—

'Michael Angelo is admitted to have been so far indebted to Orcagna as to borrow the gesture of his Christ in Judgment . . . His right hand raised as if to cast a thunderbolt, and the left closed across His breast, as refusing all mercy. The action is one which appeals to persons of very ordinary sensations, and is naturally adopted by the Renaissance painter, both for its popular effect and its capabilities for the exhibition of surgical science. But the old painter-theologian, though indeed he showed the right hand of Christ uplifted, and the left hand laid across the breast, had another meaning in the actions. The fingers of the left hand are folded in both the figures; but in Angelo's as if putting aside an appeal; in Orcagna's the fingers are bent to draw back the drapery from the right side. The right hand is raised by Michael Angelo in reprobation; by Orcagna only to show the wounded palm. And as to the believing disciples He showed His hands and His side, so that

¹ It is not necessary here to go into the question whether Orcagna means Orcagna, or only any number of men of the same name; or if the Lorenzetti of Siena were the real painters of the Pisan Campo Santo.

² Professor Ruskin's pamphlet on Tintoret and Michael Angelo, with comments and replies in Professor Poynter's lately-published lectures, may be consulted on this matter.

they were glad, so to the unbelievers at His judgment. He shows the wounds in hands and side. They shall look on Him whom they pierced.'

The Paradises or Heavens of Orcagna and Angelico may be taken together, as still maintaining ancient and traditional treatment, though with mediæval severity of doctrine. Both inclose the form of the Lord in the almond-shaped vesica, which is in fact an adaptation to pointed architecture of the late classical or Byzantine medallion form, seen in the portraits called *imagines clypeatæ*. But its use, of course, at once withdraws the whole picture from realism into symbolism, though Angelico, following Dante in his thought of an earthly Paradise, has a purist realism of his own. Orcagna's pitiless realization brings grief into Heaven itself, so that the Blessed Virgin, made the second throne therein, bows down in terror at the coming sentence, and the angels weep and wring their hands, or scramble and haul against the brute fiends for perishing souls of men. His notion of eternal happiness is, in fact, only the darker Gothic retributive contrast, just so far Christian as to add theological to civic hatred, like Tertullian at his worst. Angelico the purist shows us what seemed real to his simple and tender heart. He had evidently a feeling like Dante's, of many mansions with perfect joy in all, because the Lord is specially present in all. He had also the Dantesque taste for orderly arrangement, gardens, green fields, and flowers; perhaps he too pictured to himself walled circles in Hell, steps and terraces in Purgatory, and the graduated felicities of separate zones of Heaven.¹

But one does not quite know what to say to Angelico's Paradise of elderly Dominicans dancing for ever in deep mowing-grass with the angels. It reminds one of Luther's child-heaven, and calls for some tenderness if it does not inspire one with any particular reverence. Still it is far more reverent than Orcagna's or any one else's work who only makes his Heaven a foil to the savage force of his Inferno. The green field seems childish, perhaps; but can any of us think quietly and practically, without either gushing or sneering, that it is set before him and all of us as a great object in life to be as a little child? And if he will not have that, has he read his Shakespeare? If neither, him has Angelico offended. Falstaff talks of green fields when his time is near, and it is babble to Mrs. Quickly. In a painter, such imagery is a kind of conjectural symbolism of a possible renewing of youth and

¹ See *Modern Painters*, vol. iii. pp. 207-217; *Stones of Venice*, ii. 314.

unending freshness of life. Some of us may know (and one knows it more decidedly the older one gets) what the sensation of spring and new earth-life is to both soul and body : what it is to feel, once in five years or so in England, all that De Quincey conveys in six words, 'Lo ! it is summer, almighty summer.' Such a feeling may be capable of indefinite development. There will be summer, and green pastures, and flowers of the restored soul, says the monk of Luni ; David says so, and I after him. The friends who are gone before will be there, and look like themselves in Heaven. They will be recognizable ; and that not as now, chiefly by furrows of thought and trouble. Angels will be with them with great love for them ; they will be taken in angelic arms, and kissed with even better kisses than they denied themselves on earth. We think it quite possible to take the monk's meaning as he meant it, and maintain its symbolic conjecture. For Shakespeare, of course, modern culture will see reason to regret his mediæval barbarism in not making Falstaff die of *delirium tremens* on the stage, howling about creeping things.

The fact is, that Dante's Heaven and Angelico's have this particular feature of resemblance, that both men earnestly expected to get there some day, and both, ascending thither in heart and mind, sent their friends before them. All through the Divine Comedy we see this great personal effort, by both negative and positive method, made by the central mind of Gothic Christendom ; as to how Durante Alighieri should in due time be made absolutely pure of sin, and entirely perfect in love and heavenly wisdom, until by conjectured nature of spiritual things he should gravitate upwards to his Lord. And the nearest approach which plain people, conscious of sin, can make to the Dantean aspiration, is probably by studying the penitent's temper in the *Purgatorio*. Let us consider that as the Vision of maturing and at last perfected penitence ; as a great symbolism of the gradual expiation and cleansing of sin from the human soul. Further from, or nearer to, perfection, each soul desires perfection, and nothing else. Once admitted to the place or state of true repentance, you can turn back or look back no more, and you will not strive to get forward before the time. You shall always desire the pains which make you perfect, until you are fit for another circle of purification ; or for the final deliverance. When every stain is effaced on one stage, then only shall you desire to pass on, to further discipline, or in cleanness every whit. Your will, at least, is now with God, and so shall you be, at the day appointed. Whatever manifold meanings history and poetry

may extract from Dante's *Purgatorio*, there seems to be no doubt that he meant it to be an image of his own experience of the penitent life on earth ; and perhaps the most formidable sign we observe in men and women of our own time, overtaught or untaught, cultured or brutal, is their absolute freedom from any temper or habits of mind in the least resembling it.

III. Then it is necessary to consider, if we wish to understand what Christian people of our own age really think about Heaven, that all expressions about it must (for purposes of practical thought) be considered as symbolical or conjectural, and not literal or absolute. The Apocalypse is the Vision of S. John written in a book ; a record of things seen in the spirit and not with eyes, not as man seeth. The vision is true, but not literal ; the things are real, but not actual like earthly things. They are simply things unspeakable by the outer ('*proforic*') word of expression ; and they are indefinable by the inner ('*endiathetic*') word of thought. They are postulated as free from the conditions of time and space which limit human conception. All of us to a certain extent, proportioned to our incapacity, must accept the symbolic for the actual. Perhaps the simplest-minded person who ever read of the Holy City coming down from Heaven adorned as a bride has as good a notion of a vision of descending glory making all things new, as the most learned or brilliant of latter-day Gnostics. And this leads us to understand the sad truth of the late Mr. Bagehot's remark about philosophic Paganism in all ages ; that what makes it so formidable is that it is sufficient (at least in theory) for the Pagan. Men live in such comfort, learned leisure, and intellectual interest, almost free from temptation and excusably withdrawn from others' distress, that they feel very well where they are. If they are to look forward to Heaven at all, it cannot be a rest of over-toiled labourers or fanatical artisans, of women or the poor ; it will be worse to live with an infinite number of stupid spirits there than with a few stupid people here.

This we apprehend to be the idea expressed, or echoed with approval and made a text of, by the author of *Culture and Anarchy*. It must be a singular impatience of symbolic expression, a curious ignorance of its value for rude minds capable of belief, a peculiar defiance of Christian hope, which made him, or the 'great French moralist' quoted at p. 146, so contemptuous about the idea of 'walking about the New Jerusalem with palms in our hands.' It seems that neither of them would like it. Still it is

an historical fact that the train of ideas of which this is one, connected with the great Scriptural ideal of a Heavenly city, has for centuries employed minds of probably equal power to Professor Arnold's or the great French moralist's. John Bunyan, for instance, was a man whose poetic power of conception and expression, profound spiritual experience, and extremely practical knowledge of tinkering and soldiering, still give him a certain power over the Christian imagination. It is the weak side of culture to have to ignore the imagination; though its argumentative strength consists so much in ignoring awkward facts. But this passage occurs near the end of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, after much more Apocalyptic imagery:—

'Now just as the gates were opened to let in the men, I looked in after them; and behold the city shone like the sun, the streets also were paved with gold, and in them walked many men, with crowns on their heads, palms in their hands, and golden harps to sing praises withal. There were also of them that had wings, and they answered one another without intermission, saying, Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord. And after that they shut up the gates; which when I had seen I wished myself among them.'

Now the curious thing is, at least it must seem very odd to menti-culturists, that men of some originality and acquired intelligence still exist, who experience exactly the emotion described by Bunyan when they read that page of his book, or its original. It may be contemptible, but it is certain, that perfectly serious views, not without poetry or grave meaning, still exist about this same vision of the Holy City. I think, for example, that Mr. Spencer Stanhope's picture (now at Marlborough College) of its descent from Heaven, is one of the most beautiful and original things in art; and it is at all events the latest genuine effort I know of. But going up through Tintoret's Paradise, Dürer's Adoration of the Cross,¹ Raffaele's more academic visions; and so by Perugino to Dante, Angelico and the elders, we do find that a number of men of capacity have devoted much time and attention to this subject, and that they have done so as if they believed in it. They have not, perhaps, taken it in the sense assumed in *Culture and Anarchy*, that literally there will be a city of gold and silver, and nothing to do in it but to walk about with a palm in your hand, as if you were at Nice; but they have thought that there is a state of blessedness

¹ At Vienna; a great scene in mid-air: a Heaven with all Angelico's carnation and gold, and an earth and sea outspread below exactly like Turner.

and glory, and praise, which is the reflex of divine glory; not local as we think of space, nor golden as we think of gold. If this imagination is against the canons of culture, so much the worse for one or the other; but pooh-poohing it is all nonsense. Then we have objections made to eternal praise; which no doubt will not be a familiar or gratifying exercise to literary and scientific celebrities, much employed here in running each other down. We are supposed not only ourselves 'to expect to be made happy by sitting on clouds and singing Tate and Brady's hymns to all eternity,'¹ but to hold up that ideal to followers, who must be supposed to be more foolish than we ourselves. And it is one shade worse than talking nonsense to describe your opponents thus: for it amounts to brawling assertion of what you must suspect to be false, or cannot know to be true.

Now as to the author of the Apocalypse. He does not assert that there is anywhere in the Heavens an actual city of gold and pearl; but that he saw a vision of a city best described by those words with others. Nor does he say that the gold and the jewels are an important element in the happiness of the inhabitants; or that they want buildings to live in, or walls to defend them at all. He did not mean to appeal to human cupidity as a motive of belief, nor want the Seven Churches to be of the mind of Mammon, the least-erected spirit who fell. When he tells of jewel-foundations and pavement of wrought gold like unto glass, he is simply exhausting the language spoken by a Græco-Syrian to express beauty, and preciousness of colour, and the intensest and purest pleasure of what we here call eyesight. And the fact that he succeeded in conveying ideas of such intensity and vivacity, about a thing past knowledge to men without knowledge, is to us a proof that he spoke by the Holy Spirit of God, whatever it may be to the author of *Culture and Anarchy* and the great French moralist. It should be remembered that Christians consider that they are promised a spiritual body, or analogous organization to that which they at present inhabit. Expecting this, we think it possible that its etherealized senses may be capable of enjoying both colour and tone in some purest, or so to speak archetypal, nature. Those who will read Ezekiel i., and compare it with descriptions in the Apocalypse, will see that jewels, &c., may be used as symbolic exponents of the highest delight of colour, appealing to a purified vision. All knowledge, if you will, is acquired

¹ See *New Republic*, p. 129.

through the senses, and a Heaven of boundless knowledge has always been considered a sound and dignified conception. Now there is no reason why the sight and hearing which acquire knowledge should not themselves be transfigured into features of an infinite delight, which may be ours; they are means of happiness as well as knowledge here, and may be so hereafter.

Then as to all the graceful raillery we have had about a Heaven of psalmody or praise, or Divine service. As to the first, it is pretty certain to every one who has the wholesome use of his senses that music has latent powers over the human spirit, and is in fact symbolic of, or at least indicative of, certain infinite depths of charm and delight. And it is thus a most important argument (like beauty) for a transcendental consciousness of happiness or state of joy. And what we are told of harpers and the sound of praise seems to me curiously enough to appeal to two characteristic and very searching delights or pains (nobody can quite tell which) of music to sensitive ears. The first is that peculiar vibration or thrill of strings, which flutters through every nerve, as if it was rearranging all one's particles, like sand on a vibrating tone-plate; and the second, that passion of the singer, in uttering perfect notes alternately or together with masses of other perfect sound, which is so intensely and purely delightful as to be unendurable beyond a certain point. Conjecture from the capacities of these two senses is legitimate; and there is in fact a great argument from beauty of both sound and sight, to its originating cause and contriver, which is last and best set forth in Dr. Mozley's *Sermon on Nature*.¹ We conjecture of Heaven through the Beatitudes; because to be, and to be with, spirits absolutely made perfect in them must be blessedness absolute; and there is something quite intelligible in us here in the world which seems to lead to that. So we conjecture through faculties and characteristics of human nature, that is to say practically, of our own nature. A colourist's delight in colour is simply a harmless human emotion, let us say: but it certainly is given us to suppose that he may have it intensified in the Spirit. A musician's sense of perfect sound may make him somewhat dreamy here; but he has all the more reason to suppose it will entirely and for ever transport him in the world to come.

IV. Man is made in the image of God; and fallen and corrupted as he is at best, he can receive no image of his Maker

¹ See *Church Quarterly Review*, No. 19, April, 1880.

except in the dark and limited mirror of his own mind ; and he can only conjecture of his Maker by the analogies of his own mental and moral structure. A certain necessary risk of anthropomorphism follows, best guarded against by Dean Mansel's well-drawn distinction between likeness and analogy. We do not think of angelic harps, like Welsh harps or Egyptian harps, or Erard's patent, but we do of the thrill of perfect sound on spiritualized nerve. Our conjectures of an infinite state of happiness must be at present formed from human happiness ; and we can only see that in our own personal mirror ; so that each of us in earnest attempt to realize what Heaven may be like must think of what it will be himself to see God, himself to hear and join in the song of an infinite host. Their praise may be perfect joy to us : we shall not want to review it or analyse it, or want anything but it. It is intelligible that those who have allowed natural growth to their inborn powers of sympathy ; not encouraging them by way of sensation, but simply by seeking God with their neighbour and together, will find new sources of happiness and love also, or may experience a kind of fusion in mutual regard, in this element of praise. Perhaps our loftiest speculations about ourselves may point to some partial divestment of personality ; a self-forgetfulness whereby at least all distinguishing marks of sin and sorrow shall be lost ; and an absorption, whereby the whole will or moral being may be merged in the Divine Will. Something of this kind seems to be implied in the virtual annihilation of evil will and wayward choice from the moral being, as of doubt and pride from the intellectual. Our notions of the restored state must be formed from our notions of the restored soul ; and those again will always depend greatly on what we think our own souls may be restored to.

And here opens the great desert of difference in human conception : between the childish or anthropomorphic ideal of the simple, the contemplative view of thoughtful people, and the active one of the busy :—

‘ Houries for boys, omniscience for sages,
And wings and glories for all ranks and ages.’

Speculation on what Heaven is like is a very different thing from belief in Heaven. It is the work of imagination, and imagination is of the individual ; attempts at realization must be somebody's attempts, and the result his result. Great differences in speculation are to be expected : it is not forbidden to those who can remember how weak and tentative it must be. But as these differences in fore-

cast are popularly used to throw discredit on the great underlying Reality,¹ it seems right to observe that, on the Christian hypothesis, they cannot do so. That all sorts of persons should think eagerly about Heaven is, *valeat quantum*, an argument for the existence of a spiritual state which goes by that name. That they think variously, seems a necessity anticipated by our Lord's words of the many mansions in His Father's house; which also account for all promises of the simpler forms of happiness. That many think carnally may be only a part of the corruption or spoiling of their original or better nature; and, as a fact, their anticipations are often raised and refined in their spiritual progress here. That some think quite amiss is only a proof that the heart of man is deceitful as well as desperately wicked; able to delude itself with visions of eternal revenge or eternal sensuality. But as we possess by gift of God certain *δυνάμεις* of happiness (called by analogy virtues), there is no harm in conceiving of them as developed by the Infinite Factor into a perfect happiness past description or definition. Our conjectures vary as to these *δυνάμεις*, and according to our age and experience. Luther's child-heaven is of a piece with Angelico's, though more realistic; it is fitted for those who shall enter it. To the taste of the great French moralist, the extreme happiness of men is found '*quand ils pensent juste*:' which, if it allowed the possibility of the author's expecting any Heaven at all, would point to a state of eternal epigram; and we do not know if that is better or worse than a hunter's Paradise.² What Xenophanes said of men's inventing to themselves gods in their own likeness fits exactly with their evolution of personal heavens to suit their own taste. How pathetic, how helpless, how grotesque, how naively pedantic, how sad and hopeless are what men call their hopes; when they are too limited and self-bound! Strong will, profound interest, and deep-engraven idiosyncrasy cannot bear to think of themselves as being or doing anything very unlike what they are at in life. If they have delighted in contem-

¹ e.g. Byron, *Don Juan*, viii. 114 and *passim*.

² 'Reminiscences of the Lewis.' 'I do own to having once entertained an idea of Paradise as a large grass vale, enclosed by light stake-bound fences, with only ditches, and no rails on the landing side—intersected by meandering salmon-streams, and bounded by umbrageous mountains, on whose slopes fed huge and innumerable royals.'

Compare Richard of Hampole at the end of this Essay. This, if compared with Dante's conception, will show how unprogressive the mind of man is, in thought of things really worth thinking about.—(Milman, *Latin Christianity*, lib. xiv. ii., vol. ix.)

plation, they take the contemplative view, and *vice versa*. Socrates was both energetic and deeply abstracted in turn; and his forecast of Heaven, as we know, was a state of perpetual examination. It is a strange thing to reflect on, that the best man and best mind of Greece could only arrive at the notion of a heaven of irony. It is less priggish, no doubt, than the great French moralist's ideal; and is far superior to poor Charles Lamb's misgivings, in which irony took such a part. He protests, as follows, against any change at all: it is half jest, but also half earnest, very charming and distressing to read. He won't go anywhere if he can help it:—

'A new state of being staggers me. Sun and sky, and breeze, and solitary walks, and summer holidays, and the greenness of fields, and the delicious juices of meats and fishes, and the cheerful glass, and candle-light, and fireside conversations, and innocent vanities and jests, *and irony itself*—do these things go out with life? . . . I am in love with this green earth . . . my household gods plant a terribly fixed foot, and are not rooted up without blood. And you, my folios!—must knowledge come to me, if it come at all, by some awkward experiment of intuition, and no longer by the familiar process of reading?'

Setting aside (if one could) the humour of all this, and (what is at the bottom of it all) Lamb's elvish enjoyment in shocking all sorts of good people to whom he considered consternation was due, it is a sincere outburst of the natural man, which probably no other man ever lived to express so naturally. It may be half-heathen; but then the terrors of the soul are, in fact, ethnic, or heathen, or common to all souls: all the consolations belong to the Faith. The Lord's Resurrection is the conclusive Gospel of our life beyond the grave; and without it Immortality is to us a mere subjective speculation. But this untaught and therefore uncomfortable dread of death is what unrealized Christianity must come to. Men sustain, or are upheld in, the Christian moral standard; in right-doing, honour, kindness without limit, love for all noble deeds and words. They own the name of Christ in a way, and are supported by the body of believers who assert and defend the definite Creed, without caring enough for it themselves. The Resurrection is a part of it, a doctrine to be held, that is to say, to be held on to; and unless you contend for it, it cannot help your sad inborn apprehensions of the Shadow of Death. Our little present consciousness is an awful thing to go forth of. Charles Lamb had had plenty of conventional instruction; but confesses

the pathetic terrors of ignorance uncomfortable. Christ's Hospital seems to have taught him about as much of its Patron as S. Ebbe's or S. Aldate's schools in Oxford teach about S. Aldate or S. Ebba. He never said a word to make one doubt his holding the Christian creed in theory; but like so many, he hardly ever seems to have asked it what it could do for him, all through the continuous sufferings of his most painful life, and in the extreme need whose terrors he so well forecast. For such terror is indeed the lot of almost all believing or even thoughtful people. It is, perhaps, as well described as human language can speak at the beginning of the Dream of Gerontius; but is once and for ever expressed by our Lord's use of Psalm xxii. 1, before He Himself gave up the ghost.

From man's moral nature, and its contact with worldly environment, Butler evolved his Argument of Analogy; not to take the place of positive Evidences of Faith (as he protests, and his critics will not allow), but for collateral demonstration that the Faith is reasonable. In the same way, by analogy of the internal qualities of man, which on our hypothesis are gifts of God, we are enabled to reason to a possibility of His making man entirely blessed through their infinite development, and through their reaching Him, who is their object. And unquestionably many good men, possessing excellent gifts, are very different from each other, and develop their gifts in almost contradictory ways; and at present are often unhappy enough neither to desire nor expect the society of their fellows in their Father's house. It follows from the necessary individuality of our conceptions that they are often, on the face of them, narrow and inadequate; in fact, wrong or irreverent. Still, the promise of many abodes there with Him seems to have anticipated this difficulty in a somewhat extraordinary way. No doubt personal anticipations do clash; and that generally because people cannot, as we have said, forget themselves; but will settle matters for themselves in anthropomorphic detail. I remember an article in the *Contemporary Review* (vol. xvii.) concerning a Spiritual Theory of another Life, in which the author seemed to have made up his mind rather definitely against contemplative employment for the blessed; who ought, as he conceived, to be above it. He anticipated a state of remedial activity, mingled with anxiety, and even suffering; which struck an anxious person, not unacquainted with trouble, as disconcerting. The author had chosen David Livingstone as his ideal, and a very good one, too; but he went

on to say that that great man would never be able to get on in heaven unless he had plenty of work like what he had been doing on earth. He would feel, in fact, indolent and superannuated, though being with Christ, if he had not his great dark continent to toil and starve in. A missionary must be always on mission. But it seems that by parity of reasoning, other ministerial occupations would expect immortal continuance, and that, it would seem, involves confusion; because, as they are all part of a remedial struggle against evil, they seem to create a demand for evil in heaven to struggle against; and the popular hope to get rid of it there is much encouraged in Holy Scripture.

Perhaps in the spiritual life the active and contemplative service of God may be more nearly related than they are here in the body; or they may be identical. The Christian notion of a continued service of praise has been exposed to great contempt, and it may be absurd enough to those who don't go to church here; but when you have done so pretty regularly for fifty years, you understand, after much weariness, that the service is not all weariness, but contains experiences of rest and a kind of happiness, which may become altogether transporting as well as permanent, when the possibility of weariness is withdrawn; when all the symbolism of the service is exchanged for reality, and all that is unknown in it cleared up in the light of perfect day. Dante's ideal is not of bustle or labour, or even of missionary enterprise and new markets; but bears, so to speak, a liturgical character of contemplation and praise; not as acts involving time and fatigue, but as a new nature; as a normal outflow from restored souls, penetrated through their whole consciousness with an atmosphere of delight, with the pleasure which is in God's presence for evermore. This David certainly anticipated after death; he expected to see his dead child again in that Presence, and therefore in eternal joy. Culture has settled that he knew no more than Hadrian into what regions his or its *animula* would depart; but he certainly hit on the correct expression for the hopes of an exceeding great multitude from his time to this.

* * * * *

We cannot close this essay without some sketch of the subject of Heaven or the presence of God, as conceived by the Early Church. All the earliest Christian representations, or rather symbolisms of Heaven, sculptured or inlaid, are connected with the form of Our Lord. His presence with His Apostles in glory is certainly intended on some fourth century

sarcophagi. It is felt that where He shows His face in glory there is Heaven. He is generally placed on the Rock of the Four Rivers of Paradise, bearing the cross of triumph, and standing above the veiled and aged form of Uranus, who represents the firmament which is under His feet. And when the Apostles fill their niches at His side also, and the miracles of love and power are carved around, one cannot doubt that this idea is to be conveyed: that we, all living men, are to look to a time when we shall see Him as He is, and a state of joy in His presence shall verily begin for us and not end. It is the promise of the third Beatitude. In point of fact this, as Dante really felt, is the central notion of Heaven beyond which the human soul cannot reach, and which, indeed, it can now only apprehend at a distance. All questions about employment, active or contemplative, about continued strife and victory over evil, about incessant ascription and reverberation of praise, seem to answer themselves or to disappear in this great Ideal of His presence, filling all things including ourselves. This is the centre of Dante's and Milton's hierarchies; and the earliest Christian tombs expressed it in their way. They date from the Anician sarcophagi, of Junius Bassus, Probus and Proba, in 359 and 360. Sculpture dies away altogether in the next century, and mosaic takes its place. Eastern instinct of colour is then the only poetic gift remaining to the Empire; and the growing distresses of the Church, and her burden of doubt and controversy, turn the ascetic artist to the Revelation of S. John. He there finds descriptions of things seen in the spirit, which he himself hopes to see; and finds that he can produce some reflection of his imaginations about them; and not without power, thanks to the gem-like colours of his mosaics. He begins with the presence of Christ with the saints, which is or constitutes Heaven to them. The typical example, perhaps, may be the mosaic in the Church at S. Apollinare nella Città in Ravenna. Here there is on the frieze, above the central aisle-columns of the basilica, a procession in mosaic of male and female saints, men on one side adoring the Lord Himself in glory, on the other women, headed by the Magi, approaching Him as the Holy Child in the arms of His mother. The head of the Saviour is very beautiful, though it shows much of the sadness of decadent art. All the figures are white-robed, and walk on emerald-green turf; separated from each other by palms (as often in the sarcophagi), but the trees here bear scarlet dates. The figures are shed with scarlet, and bear small crowns of

the same colour in their hands, in act to cast them before the Lord. The background is of gold, not bearing a large proportion to the size of the figures; but above them are white single figures with ample golden spaces; and a third course of curious mosaic subjects from the New Testament runs round below the roof, with grounds of alternate gold and black.¹ The splendid and jewelled effect of the whole is beyond praise; but there is a perhaps even more striking example of the treatment of the same subject in S. Prassede at Rome.² The Court of Heaven is on the chancel-arch, and on its sides the saints and martyrs in white robes with the laticlave are casting down their crowns.³ Here the Lamb is over the arch, placed on a jewelled throne like a modern Anglican altar-table, with a plain cross above, and a jewelled Book on the step; on either side two angels, with the nimbus, and standing on the clouds. At one end is the evangelistic man-symbol of S. Matthew; at the other, S. John's eagle. The other two symbols and the twenty-four elders have been destroyed. On the vault of the apse, or tribune, are large figures representing the introduction of the two Saints to our Lord (with S. Felix as church-builder) by SS. Peter and Paul. The martyrs bear their crowns, but the group may; perhaps, involve a slight bathos, as the special elevation of any particular modern person in pictures of Heaven always does. This picture, too, is noticed by M. Vitet as the first one which adopts the grimly-ascetic type of face for saints; its date synchronizes well with that of the mournful Redeemer of S. Apollinare nella Città at Ravenna. But the form of Christ redeems all. He is standing on the clouds, and it is dark under His feet. The idea of the sarcophagi is expanded; the firmament is beneath Him, and He walks upon the wings of the wind. The face is grave and stern; but the majesty of the whole figure amounts to awe; it seems to tower and fill the Temple, and impress its appearance on the worshipper. It has often seemed to me that, if Phidias had entered such an apse, he would have been strangely reminded of the effect of his own vast Agalmata, and might have thought that, as barbarians working for barbarians, these

¹ For Ravenna, see Mr. Parkes' *Mosaics, &c.*, or Von Quast's standard work in colour.

² See Parker's *Archæology of Rome*, part xi. S. Prassede was rebuilt on a new site in the time of Paschal I., A.D. 817-829. His monogram remains on the Arch of Triumph, above the altar; and an inscription in mosaic letters also records that the picture is his work.

³ The central picture is copied from that of SS. Cosmas and Damianus, built by Felix IV., A.D. 526-530.

melancholy men of Hesperia had produced nearly the same result as he. In this mosaic, as in others, the Church militant on earth is represented by thirteen sheep; one the central Lamb of God, the others standing for the Apostles, as first-fruits of mankind. In S. Prassede, and elsewhere, they are separated from the place of Glory by a winding ribbon of blue mosaic, which generally bears on it the name JORDANES; and they issue six on a side from the two houses or cities, HIERUSALEM and BETHLEHEM. Sometimes they are surrounded (see S. Apollinaris in Classe) by strange representations of trees and bushes, which probably stand for the wilderness of this world.

The purpose of this essay is answered if it has pointed out that these and other primitive pictures of Heaven are consciously symbolic, and never were thought of as literal: as the Apocalypse itself is a vision of mysteries, things which shall be hereafter; but how far like them in literal actuality the Church knows not as yet. But there is one step for us further backward into antiquity, and that a long one. It is quite understood by archæologists how closely the Evangelistic symbols of the Apocalypse, which occur in almost every early Heaven, are connected with the cherubic vision of Ezekiel.¹ This connexion struck the Gothic imagination, as we see by the Lombard Griffins of Verona and Siena (see *Modern Painters*, vol. iii. p. 112), which often bear wheels to carry back the mind to the beginning of his prophecy; and all readers of Dante will remember the griffin-chariot at the end of the Purgatorio. But its first representation in Art is that of the Ascension Chariot of our Lord in the wonderful sixth-century MS. of Rabula, the Syrian monk of Zagba, now in the Laurentian Library at Florence, which greatly and curiously resembles the allegory of Dante. But it cannot be doubted that the forms described by Ezekiel in ch. i were known to him as Cherubs of Glory, by reason of his being a priest, acquainted, as other Israelites were not, with the shapes on the Ark of the Covenant. He must have felt that he was permitted to see what Moses had seen. These visions do in fact, and in the most solemn way, assert God's special manifestation of Himself to the human consciousness. They may or may not be dismissed as figments, but this is what they proclaim; and the descriptive language verily is that of men who have seen

¹ For the etymology of the word Cherub, its connexion with Gryps or Griffin, see Dr. Hayman's article in *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, s. v. Cherub.

things beyond words, the fourfold Faces and Wings which make such wild grotesques under human realization; the Wheels in whom was the Spirit of the Living Creatures; to whom was said, 'O Wheel!' The great cloud out of the north, the fire enfolding itself, the shapes of lightning, the firmament above as terrible crystal, the brightness of amber and flame, and the likeness of a Throne and One sitting thereon: these are the expressions of a man who, having seen the glory of God, finds his powers of conception and expression, the thought of his brain and the language of his fathers, fail him altogether.

It is an odd kind of harmonious contrast to place, beside this view of God's presence experienced in ecstasy, the negative or human attempt to express the soul's desire of deliverance from evil, made by Richard of Hampole before Chaucer's day. He must have thought long of the Paradise of his hopes, and seen much of the world he hoped to exchange for it.

'Ther is lyf withoute ony deth,
And ther is youthe withoute ony elde,
And ther is alle manner welth to welde,
And ther is rest without ony travaille,
And ther is pees without ony strife,
And ther is alle mannere likynge of life.
And ther is bright somer ever to be;
And ther is nevere wynter in that cuntree;
And ther is more worshipe and honour
Than ever hadde kynge other emperour.
And ther is greter melodie of aungeles songe,
And ther is preysing hem amonge;
And ther is alle maner friendship that may be,
And ther is evere perfect love and charitie;
And ther is wisdom without folye.
And ther is honeste without vilenage,
All these a man may joyes of Heven call,
And yette the most sovereign joye of alle
Is the sight of Goddes bright face
In whom resteth alle manere grace.

Richard of Hampole, quoted from MSS.
by Turner, *History of England*,
v. 233.¹

This poem, the 'Pricke of Conscience,' by Richard Rolle de Hampole, has been printed (1863) by the Philological Society.

¹ See Milman's *Latin Christianity*, xiv. 11, vol. ix. p. 97, ed. 1867.

ART. V.—THE SACRIFICIAL TEACHING OF
THE ANCIENT LITURGIES.

1. *Liturgies: Eastern and Western.* Edited by C. E. HAMMOND. (Oxford: 1879.)
2. *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio.* Opera EUSEBII REAUDOTII. (Paris: 1716.)
3. *The Nestorians and their Rituals.* By the Rev. GEORGE PERCY BADGER. (London: 1852.)
4. *Notitia Eucharistica.* By the Rev. W. E. SCUDAMORE. Second Edition. (London: 1876.)
5. *Benedictus XIV.: De Sacrificio Missæ.* (Patavii: 1755.)
6. *Theological Defence for the Right Rev. Alexander Penrose Forbes, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin.* (London, 1860.)
7. *The One Offering: a Treatise on the Sacrificial Nature of the Eucharist.* By the Rev. M. F. SADLER. (London: 1875.)
8. *The Teaching of the Church during the First Three Centuries on the Doctrines of the Christian Priesthood and Sacrifice.* By the Rev. CHARLES BERNARD DRAKE, M.A. (London: 1874.)
9. *The Sacrificial Aspect of the Holy Eucharist: An Eirenicon.* By the Rev. E. F. WILLIS. (Oxford: 1878.)

WHEN reviewing, in our last number but one, Mr. Hutton's work against the Anglican priesthood, and Cardinal Newman's most unfortunate Preface thereto, we had occasion to point out the manner in which the peculiar structure of the Roman Missal (whether original, or due to unskilful reconstruction at an early date) causes it to fail when called in witness to the received doctrine of the Church of Rome on the Eucharistic Sacrifice, as formulated by the Council of Trent in its twenty-second Session. And, while rejecting for ourselves that view of Waterland's which the Cardinal alleged to be the highest doctrine fairly tenable in the Church of England, we showed that Waterland would have had a good deal more to say in defence of his opinions had he been dealing with the Roman Liturgy instead of the Anglican one. But Cardinal Newman would have been quite justified by facts had he urged that Waterland is regarded by a not insignificant section of English Churchmen as a satisfactory exponent of Eucharistic doctrine, so that his treatise has consequently enjoyed the little-merited honour of a modern reprint, and has even been

put in the examination lists of more than one bishop. Nor is acceptance of his theory entirely confined to those who make no claim to belong to the historical High Church succession. There are minds so constituted as to have a stronger affinity for negative assertions than for positive ones; and several of these in our own days fasten, as it were instinctively, and certainly with tenacity, on those expressions only of writers like Andrewes, Jeremy Taylor, Mede, Cosin, and Bramhall, which are directed against what they regarded as excessive or erroneous definitions on the part of Roman Catholic divines, while their positive statements as to what they actually believed themselves are passed by as of no moment. And one consequence of such a temper is that the ancient Liturgies—so far as men of this stamp refer to them at all, or accept them as evidence of early Christian doctrine—have been approached in the same spirit, and Waterlandism, with its formal and pre-eminently unevangelical denial of any offering of Christ in the Eucharist, has been read into them as resolutely as the Privy Council has read a penal prohibition of the vestments of the second year of Edward VI. into the Ornaments Rubric. When this is so, it is not surprising that the Fathers have fared no better, and that small account has been taken of the fact that they wrote for people whose chief religious service was the Holy Eucharist, celebrated in the then vernacular, and that they had thus little occasion to dwell on aspects of doctrine which were brought before the Christian public, at least once weekly, in definite language and action.

We do not propose to enter into a detailed discussion of the general question of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in the present paper, which is designed rather as a collection of materials, whence our readers can draw conclusions for themselves; but it is necessary to preface the following catena of quotations with a few words to the effect that the Oriental Liturgies, whatever interpolations and accretions they may have suffered in the lapse of time, are, with very few and trifling exceptions, structurally now what they have been from the beginning, and have undergone no such process of hewing asunder and readjusting in a changed order, as is not less visible in the Roman and Ambrosian Missals than in the Anglican one, to the trained eyes of liturgical experts. Consequently, they are organic wholes, leading up from the first to one definite climax, and therefore not hesitating to employ in their earlier portions language which, on any strict application of the element of time, seems at least premature, but which is due

to a process of anticipation, natural enough in a rite viewed as one unbrokenly continuous action throughout, and which process, often at least, is couched in terms plainly implying a still future fulfilment. And it is further to be observed that the stronger any such expressions are which occur before the actual Consecration of the Gifts, the more difficult do they make the task of minimizers, because no parallel for such terms of awe and reverence can be discovered in the most fervid Rabbinical teachings relating to the Levitical ordinances; and still less in anything we can gather from classical Paganism in its allusions to the sacrifices of heathen temples. To suppose that the Christians of a lettered era, such as that of the Antonines and their immediate successors, with a powerful Hebrew tradition in their own ranks to influence them on the one hand, while having on the other the strongest motive for avoiding anything which savoured of heathen superstition and idolatry, could have deliberately adopted language and ideas relating to a mere symbolical offering of the fruits of the earth, which were capable of becoming even the germ of the liturgies of the fourth century—if no claim for a much earlier date be made for the oldest rites, as it well may be—is a hypothesis beset with critical and moral difficulties which are simply insurmountable; as they require us to acknowledge the prevalence of a superstitious credulity amongst the evangelizers of the Roman Empire, which sinks below the level of even Egyptian heathenism itself, not to say such comparatively lofty idolatry as the worship of Jupiter and Apollo.

The subjoined citations are arranged in the order of their occurrence in the several liturgies quoted, distinguishing phrases used in the introductory or 'pro-anaphoral' portion from those in the actual Canon or Anaphora, and from the rarer post-communion allusions; but no inquiry is here instituted respecting the date or authenticity of the documents employed, which is an altogether different branch of the subject, and not immediately relevant.

I. The Liturgy of the Apostolical Constitutions, or Clementine Liturgy.

In this Liturgy there is no pro-anaphoral reference to the act of Sacrifice, and the first phrase of the kind which occurs is in the Canon, immediately after the recitation of the Institution, thus:

(a.) 'Wherefore, having in remembrance His Passion, Death, and Resurrection from the dead, His return into heaven, and His future second appearing, when He shall come with glory and power to judge the quick and the dead, and to render to every man according

to his works : we offer to Thee, our King and our God, according to this institution, this Bread and this Cup, giving thanks to Thee through Him, that Thou hast thought us worthy to stand before Thee, and to sacrifice unto Thee. And we beseech Thee that Thou wouldest look graciously on these gifts now lying before Thee, O Thou self-sufficing God, and accept them to the honour of Thy Christ. And send down Thy Holy Spirit, the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, on this sacrifice, that He may make this bread the Body of Thy Christ, and this cup the Blood of Thy Christ.'

It is at this point, and by this Invocation, according to the unanimous teaching of the Oriental Churches, that the Act of Consecration takes place, and not by the recitation of the words of Institution. Consequently, so far, only a presentation of bread and wine has been made. But at the close of the general Intercession, and after the full Consecration, the Deacon proclaims :

(b.) 'Again and again let us pray to God through His Christ on behalf of the gift that is offered to the Lord God ; that the good God may receive it through the mediation of His Christ at His heavenly altar for a sweet-smelling savour.'

To understand the full meaning of these words, in themselves not intensified at all, as compared with the preceding clause, it is needful to cite the remarkable hymn of Eucharistic adoration, with which the congregation responds to the Bishop's words, 'Holy things for holy persons,' uttered at the point where the elevation of the Gifts takes place in other Liturgies, and therefore presumably did so in this one also. It runs :

'One Holy, one Lord, one Jesus Christ, to the glory of God the Father, blessed for evermore. Amen. Glory be to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men. Hosanna to the Son of David. Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord. God is the Lord, and He hath appeared unto us. Hosanna in the highest.'

This is decisive as to *what*, in the intention of the Clementine Liturgy, was being offered conjointly at the earthly and heavenly altars.

II. *Greek S. James.*

This very ancient relic is much fuller than the preceding liturgy in its references to sacrifice, which begin at the very outset of the rite ; for the celebrant, in the opening prayer, uses the following words in the course of his petitions :

(a.) '... I am not worthy to present myself before this Thy sacred and spiritual table, where Thine Only Begotten Son, and our

Lord Jesus Christ, is mystically set forth (*πρόκειται*) as a Sacrifice for me a sinner, marked with every stain.'

(b.) At the Prayer of the Incense, the priest continues :

' . . . Purify us from every spot, and cause us to stand pure before Thy holy Altar, that we may offer to Thee the sacrifice of praise.'

(c.) At the Little Entrance, the priest says :

' . . . Seeing that we are full of fear and trembling, when about to stand before Thy holy Altar, send down upon us, O Lord, Thy good grace, and sanctify our minds and bodies and spirits, and change our dispositions towards piety, that we, with a pure conscience, may offer to Thee gifts, presents, fruits, to the putting away of our transgressions, and for the purification of all Thy people, through,' &c.

(d.) Prayer of the Cherubic Hymn :

' Let all mortal flesh keep silence, and stand with fear and trembling, and ponder nothing earthly in itself ; for the King of kings and Lord of lords, Christ our God, cometh forward to be sacrificed, and to be given for food to the faithful.'

(e.) First Prayer of Oblation of the Gifts (the Great Entrance) :

' O God, our God, Who didst send forth the Heavenly Bread, the nourishment of the whole world, our Lord Jesus Christ, as our Saviour and Redeemer, and Benefactor ; blessing and sanctifying us, Thyself bless this offering, and receive it at Thy super-celestial Altar . . .'

(f.) Second Prayer of Oblation, after the Great Intercession :

' Lord and Master, Thou that dost visit us with mercies and loving-kindnesses, and hast freely given boldness to us Thy humble, sinful, and unworthy servants, to stand before Thy holy altar, and to offer to Thee the awful and unbloody sacrifice for our sins and for the ignorance of the people . . . Vouchsafe, Master, that we may be servants of Thy New Testament, ministers of Thy spotless mysteries ; and according to the multitude of Thy mercy receive us, who approach to Thy holy altar, that we may be worthy to offer to Thee gifts and sacrifices for our own ignorances and for those of the people ; and grant us, O Lord, with all fear and with a good conscience to set before Thee this spiritual and unbloody sacrifice, receiving which unto Thy holy and super-celestial and rational Altar, for a savour of spiritual sweetness, send down to us in its stead the grace of Thine all-holy Spirit. Yea, O God, look upon us, and have regard to this our reasonable sacrifice, and receive (as Thou didst receive the gifts of Abel, the sacrifices of Noah, the priestly offerings of Moses and Aaron, the peace-offerings of Samuel, the repentance of David, the incense of Zacharias ; as Thou didst receive from the hand of Thine

Apostles this true worship), thus receive also from the hands of us sinners, in Thy goodness, these gifts that are laid before Thee. And grant that our oblations may be well-pleasing to Thee, and hallowed by the Holy Ghost, for a propitiation of our transgressions, and of the ignorance of the people, and for the repose of the souls that have fallen asleep.'

(g.) After the words of Institution, and before the Invocation, the Priest says :

'We therefore also . . . offer to Thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice.'

(h.) After the Consecration he adds :

'We offer them [the gifts] also to Thee, O Lord, for Thy holy place and for Thy Holy Catholic Apostolic Church throughout the world.'

(i.) After the elevation at the 'Holy Things,' &c. :

'Behold the Lamb of God, and Son of the Father, that taketh away the sin of the world, sacrificed for the life and salvation of the world.'

III. *Syriac S. James*, an independent variant of the same norm :

(a.) After the opening prayer, the Deacon says :

'Let us stand fitly and pray, let us give thanks, let us worship and praise the living Lamb of God, which is offered upon the Altar.'

(b.) The Priest, immediately afterwards :

' . . . Turn not Thy face from us whilst we celebrate this spiritual [v. l. awful] and unbloody sacrifice.'

(c.) At the Offertory, and after the words of Institution :

' . . . 'We offer to Thee this awful and unbloody sacrifice, that Thou mayest not deal with us, O Lord, according to our sins, nor reward us according to our iniquities . . .'

(d.) After the Invocation :

'Wherefore we offer to Thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice for Thy holy place . . .' (and so on through the Great Intercession for quick and dead, during which, at the commemoration of the Saints, is said as follows) :—

(a.) 'Wherefore we make commemoration of them, that whilst they stand before Thy throne, they may remember our humility and weakness, and together with us offer unto Thee this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice, for the safe-keeping of the living, for the consolation of the weak and the unworthy, such as we are ; for the repose

and happy memory of them who have long since departed in the true faith, our fathers, brethren, and masters,' &c.

(f.) The 'Catholic' prayer, after the Fraction :

'Again and again through this holy oblation and propitiatory sacrifice, which is offered to God the Father, and is hallowed, completed, and perfected by the descent of the Holy and quickening Spirit, we pray again more earnestly for our eminent father the Priest who hath offered and consecrated it, and for the altar of God whereon it is presented, and for the blessed people who draw near and receive it in true faith, and for those on whose behalf it is offered and consecrated . . . Receive this oblation, O Lord, as that of the Prophets and Apostles.'

(g.) After the 'Holy Things, &c.' the Deacon says :

' . . . The Heavenly Powers stand with us in the midst of the sanctuary, and do service to the Body of the Son of God, which is sacrificed before us.'

(h.) Prayer for the Dead, found in some MSS. of this Liturgy :

'Behold, the oblation is offered, and behold, the souls are purified. Let repose be attained thereby for the dead, on whose behalf it is offered. That oblation which is brought by the living for the dead, expiates the iniquity of the soul, and by it their sins are remitted.'

IV. *Liturgy of S. Mark.*

(a.) Prayer of the Little Entrance :

' . . . Purify our lips and our hearts from all pollution and from all iniquity ; that with a pure heart and pure conscience, we may offer to Thee this sacrifice for a sweet-smelling savour, and for the remission of our sins, and of the sins of Thy people.'

(b.) Prayer of the Incense :

'Incense is offered to Thy Name. Let it ascend, we pray Thee, out of the poor hands of us sinners, to Thy super-celestial altar, as a sweet-smelling savour for the propitiation of all Thy people.'

(c.) Prayer of the Oblation :

'We offer to Thee this reasonable unbloody sacrifice, which all nations offer to Thee, O Lord, from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same, from the north to the south, for Thy Name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense is offered to Thy Name, and a pure offering.'

(d.) After the Commemoration of the Departed :

'The thank-offerings of them that offer sacrifices and oblations receive, O God, to Thy holy and super-celestial and spiritual altar,

to the height of the heavens, by Thine archangelic Ministry, [those] of them that offered much or little, secretly and with open boldness, of them that desired, and had not wherewithal to offer, of them that have brought this day their oblations ; as Thou didst receive the gifts of Thy righteous servant Abel, [*Here the Priest offers incense, and adds*] the sacrifice of our father Abraham, the incense of Zacharias, the alms of Cornelius, and the two mites of the widow, receive also their thank-offerings, &c.

The post-consecration portion of this Liturgy dwells almost exclusively on the act and benefits of Communion, and is sacrificial only by implication. That is to say, it is perfectly easy to read a sacrificial meaning into several of its phrases, and it is the most probable one of which they are patient, but express words to that effect are absent : a peculiarity in which S. Mark stands well-nigh alone amongst ancient Liturgies, and in which it is not followed by those other Alexandrine rites whose norm it is.

V. *Greek Liturgy of S. Basil.*

(a.) Prayer of the Offertory :

' . . . Receive us, according to the multitude of Thy mercy, who draw near to Thy holy altar, that we may be worthy to offer Thee this reasonable and unbloody sacrifice, for our own sins, and for the ignorances of the people : receiving which at Thy holy and spiritual altar for a sweet-smelling savour, send down on us in return the grace of Thy Holy Spirit. Regard us, O Lord, and look upon this our service, and accept it, as Thou didst accept the gifts of Abel, the sacrifices of Noah, the whole burnt-offerings of Abraham, the priestly ministrations of Moses and Aaron, the peace-offerings of Samuel ; as Thou didst accept this true service from Thy holy Apostles, so accept these gifts in Thy goodness, O Lord, from the hands of us sinners, that, counted worthy to minister blamelessly at Thy holy altar, we may find the reward of faithful and wise stewards, in the dreadful day of Thy just retribution.'

(b.) After the words of Institution, the Priest continues :

' Therefore we also, O Master, remembering the saving Passion, the quickening Cross, the three days' burial, the Resurrection from the dead, the Ascension to the heavens, the Session on Thy right hand, God and Father, and His glorious and terrible second Advent, offer Thee Thine own of Thine own.'

The other relevant portions of this Liturgy are supplied from that which follows.

VI. *Liturgy of S. Chrysostom.*

(a.) First Prayer of the Faithful :

' . . . Receive, O God, our supplications ; make us worthy to offer to Thee supplications and prayers, and unbloody sacrifices for all Thy people.'

(b.) Prayer of the Cherubic Hymn :

'Thou didst take the title of our High Priest, and didst give to us the priestly office of this liturgical and unbloody sacrifice Strengthen, with the might of Thy Holy Spirit, me that have been endowed with the grace of the Priesthood, that I may stand by this Thy holy altar, and sacrifice Thy holy and spotless Body and precious Blood. For I draw near to Thee, bowing my neck, and I pray Thee : Turn not Thy face away from me, nor reject me from the number of Thy sons ; but vouchsafe that these gifts may be offered to Thee by me, a sinner and Thine unworthy servant. For Thou art He that offerest and art offered, and receivest and art distributed, Christ our God, and to Thee we ascribe glory with the Father and the Holy Spirit, now and ever and to ages of ages : Amen.'

(c.) Prayer of Oblation :

'Lord God Almighty, Only Holy, Who receivest the sacrifice of praise from them that call upon Thee with their whole heart, receive also the supplication of us sinners, and cause it to approach to Thy holy altar, and enable us to present gifts to Thee, and spiritual sacrifices for our sins, and for the errors of the people : and cause us to find grace in Thy sight, that this our sacrifice may be acceptable unto Thee, and that the good Spirit of Thy grace may tabernacle upon us, and upon these gifts presented unto Thee, and upon all Thy people.'

(d.) After the Words of Institution, and the Commemoration of the Passion, &c. :

'In behalf of all, and for all, we offer Thee Thine own of Thine own.'

(e.) After the Invocation :

'And further we offer to Thee this reasonable service on behalf of those who have departed in the faith, our forefathers, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, virgins, and every just spirit made perfect in the faith.'

(f.) 'Furthermore, we offer to Thee this reasonable service for the whole world ; for the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and for them that live in chastity and holiness of life, for our most faithful sovereigns, beloved of Christ, all their court and army,' &c.

(g.) At the Fraction :

'The Lamb of God is broken and distributed : He that is broken and not divided in sunder ; ever eaten and never consumed, but sanctifying the communicants.'

VII. *Armenian Liturgy.*

(a.) Prayer before the Oblation :

' . . . And since one of the Most Holy Trinity is being offered, and another takes pleasure in us through the blood of His firstborn

Son that reconciles us to Him, do Thou, O Holy Spirit, receive our supplications, and make us a fit habitation for Thee, through every worthy preparation for the delicious tasting of the Heavenly Lamb.'

(b.) Prayer of the Oblation :

'O Lord God, our Saviour, Preserver, and Benefactor, Who didst send into the world the heavenly Bread of our Lord Jesus Christ as food for this world, to bless and to sanctify us ; be pleased, O Lord, Thyself to bless this our oblation. Receive it on thy heavenly table. Remember, beneficent and loving as Thou art, both those who offer it to Thee, and those for whom it is offered.'

(c.) Censing the Oblation, the priest says :

'I offer Thee incense, O Christ, the sweet smell of a spiritual offering. Receive it as a sweet-smelling savour into Thy heavenly and intellectual place of offering,' &c.

(d.) Hymn of the Incense :

'... We, of the orders of priests, deacons, clerks, and ecclesiastics, gathered together on this day, offer Thee incense, O Lord, after the example of Zacharias of old. Let our supplications, sent up through this incense, be acceptable unto Thee, as were the sacrifices of Abel, Noah, and Abraham.'

(e.) Prayer of the Cherubic Hymn.

As in *S. Chrysostom* (VI. b) with slight verbal differences.

(f.) Prayer of Oblation :

'... Thou, O Lord, to Whom we offer this oblation, accept this our presentation, and consummate it into a sacramental rite and offering of the Body and Blood of Thine only Begotten Son.'

(g.) After the Kiss of Peace, the deacon says :

'Christ, the Lamb of God, is offered in sacrifice.'

(h.) After the words of Institution, the priest, taking the oblations in his hands, says :

'We, therefore, O Lord, presenting unto Thee this saving Mystery of the Body and Blood of Thine Only Begotten Son, ... offer to Thee of Thine own, in all things and for all things.'

(i.) The whole of the Great Intercession, after the Invocation, is made through the merits of the Oblation, thus :

'Through it, grant love, security, and needed peace, to the whole world ; to the Holy Church ... kings of the earth and princes ... &c.

'Through it, grant a wholesome blending of the air, and to the fields fruitfulness.

'Through it, grant repose to all who have ere now fallen asleep in Christ.'

(j.) The Deacon's Intercession for the Living :

'We offer Thee, O God, praise and glory for the holy and immortal sacrifice which is on this holy Table, that Thou wilt vouchsafe it to be for us unto holiness of life. Through it grant love, safety, and needed peace to the whole world, to Thy Holy Church,' &c.

'Remember, O Lord, bless and have mercy on Thy congregation here present, and on those who offer this oblation and sacrifice.' &c.
'... We intreat the Lord through the holy and divine sacrifice which is on the Holy Table. We intreat the Lord our God, Who accepteth it, placed on His holy, heavenly and intellectual table, to send us in return for it the grace and gifts of His Holy Spirit.'

(k.) Prayer after the Elevation :

'Look upon us, O our Lord Jesu Christ, from Thy holy heavens, and from the throne of Thy glory ; come to purify and quicken us, Thou who sittest with the Father, and art here offered ; vouchsafe to give us of Thy spotless Body and of Thy precious Blood, and through our hands to all the congregation.'

(l.) Prayer of Communion, after the Fraction :

'Holy Father . . . vouchsafe to accept this holy Mystery for the remission of our sins . . . according to Thine unspeakable love, grant that this [Mystery] may be for the expiation of sins and the loosing of transgressions,' &c.

VIII. *Æthiopic Universal Canon.*

(a.) Prayer of Oblation :

'O Lord our God, Who didst receive the sacrifice of Abel in the field, of Noah in the ark, of Abraham on the mountain-top, of Elijah on Mount Carmel, of David in the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite, and the widow's mites in the sanctuary ; so receive the oblation and sacrifice of Thy servants, which they have offered to Thy holy Name, and let it be for the remission of their sins, and of the sins of Thy people, and give them therefor a good return, in this world, and in that which is to come, now and ever, and to ages of ages, Amen.'

(b.) Second Prayer of Oblation :

'Jesu Christ, our King . . . show Thy face upon this Bread and on this Cup, which we have presented on this Thy spiritual altar : bless, hallow, and purify them, and change this Bread that it may become Thy pure Body, and that which is mingled in this Cup Thy precious Blood, and let them be for us an oblation unto healing and to the salvation of our soul and body . . . '

(c.) Prayer of the Incense :

'... Grant that we may offer to Thee a reasonable oblation and a spiritual sacrifice of thanksgiving, that we may enter into the innermost of the Most Holy Place.'

(d.) Prayer of the Great Oblation, after the words of Institution :

‘Now, O Lord, making commemoration of Thy death and resurrection, we offer to Thee this Bread and this Cup, giving thanks to Thee, because through them Thou hast made us worthy to stand before Thee, and to do Thee priestly service.’

The latter portion of this Liturgy is mainly taken up with acts of Eucharistic adoration, and it has no more directly sacrificial clauses.

IX. *Liturgy of SS. Adæus and Maris*, or Persian rite.

(a.) Prayer of the Oblation :

‘May Christ, Who was sacrificed for our salvation, and commanded that we should make commemoration of His death and resurrection, Himself receive this sacrifice from our weak hands, through His grace and mercies for ever. Amen.’

‘The august, holy, and quickening mysteries are set on the altar of the mighty God, until His coming, for ever. Amen.’

(b.) Orate Fratres :

‘Pray for me, my fathers, brethren, and masters, that God may give me strength and power to fulfil this ministry to which I have drawn near, and may receive this oblation from my feeble hands, for myself, for you, and for the whole body of the Holy Catholic Church, through his grace and mercies, for ever. Amen.’

(c.) Response to the Orate Fratres :

‘May Christ hear thy prayers, and accept thy sacrifice, and receive thine oblation, and honour thy priesthood, and grant us, through thine intervention, pardon of our sins and remission of our offences, through His grace and mercies, for ever. Amen.’

(d.) The priest rejoins, addressing the deacon :

‘God, the Lord of all, confirm thy words, and grant thee peace, and receive this oblation from my hands, for me, and for thee, for the whole body of the Holy Catholic Church, and for the entire world, through His grace and mercies for ever. Amen.’

(e.) Secret Prayer of the Priest :

‘O Lord God Almighty, help my weakness, through Thy mercy and the aid of Thy grace, and make me worthy to offer this oblation before Thee, for the common benefit of all, and to the praise of the Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Amen.’

(f.) At the Preface, after the Sursum Corda, the priest says :

℣. ‘The oblation is being offered to God, the Lord of all.’ ℞. ‘It is meet and right.’

(g.) Prayer at the Incense :

'O Lord, O Lord, give me an open face before Thee, that with the confidence which cometh of Thee, we may accomplish this tremendous and divine sacrifice, with consciences void of all sin and bitterness.'

(h.) Great Intercession :

'O Lord God Almighty, receive this oblation, for the entire Holy Catholic Church, and for all our godly and righteous fathers who were well-pleasing unto Thee. . . . O Lord our God, according to Thy mercies, and the multitude of Thy graces, look on Thy people, and on me who am feeble, and not according to my sins and my ignorances ; but that they may be worthy of remission of their sins through this holy Body, which they receive with faith, through the grace of Thy mercy, to ages of ages.'

(i.) Prayer of Bowing Down :

'O Lord, through Thy manifold and unspeakable mercies, grant a good and acceptable memorial to all our godly and righteous fathers, who were well-pleasing unto Thee, in the commemoration of the Body and Blood of Thy Christ, which we offer unto Thee upon Thy pure and holy altar, as Thou hast taught us, and grant us Thy peace all the days of this world.'

(j.) Invocation :

'And let Thine Holy Spirit come, O Lord, and brood upon this oblation of Thy servants, which they offer, and bless and hallow it, that it may be unto us, O Lord, for the propitiation of our sins and the remission of transgressions, for a great hope of resurrection from the dead, and new life in the kingdom of heaven. . . .'

(k.) At the Fraction :

'We draw near, O Lord, with true faith, and break with thanksgiving, and sign through Thy mercy, the Body and Blood of our Quickener, Jesus Christ, in the Name,' &c.

(l.) After the Intinction :

'These august, holy, quickening, and divine mysteries are divided, hallowed, consummated, perfected, united, and mingled one with another, in the worshipful and glorious Name of Thy glorious Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ; that they may be unto us, O Lord, for the propitiation of sins and the remission of transgressions, also for a great hope of resurrection from the dead, and of a new life in the kingdom of heaven ; for us and for the holy Church of Christ our Lord, here and in every place, now and ever, and to ages of ages.

X. *Liturgy of Malabar.*

(a.) At the Offertory, the priest says :

'Expecting I expected the Lord, the Body of Christ and His precious Blood, on the holy altar. Let us all offer it with fear and honour, and with the Angels let us exclaim : Holy, Holy, Holy is our Lord God.'

The Deacon responds : 'The poor shall eat and be satisfied with the Body of Christ and His precious Blood upon the holy altar. Let us all offer it with fear and reverence, and with the Angels let us exclaim : Holy, Holy, Holy is our Lord God. Let us pray. Peace be with us.'

Priest : 'Let glory be offered and immolated to Thine ever glorious Trinity for ages of ages ; and may Christ, Who was offered as an oblation for our salvation, and hath commanded us that we should sacrifice in memory of His Passion, Death, Burial, and Resurrection, receive this sacrifice from our hands, through His grace and His love, for ages of ages.' *Placing the oblations on the altar, he adds :* 'Let these exceedingly glorious, holy, and quickening Mysteries be constituted and ordained upon the holy altar of Christ, until the glorious Advent from heaven of the same, to Whom be laud, glory, and worship, now and ever, and to ages of ages.'

(b.) Prayer of the Deacon, after the Creed :

'Let us pray, furthermore, that this oblation may be favourably received, that by the Word of God and the Holy Ghost it may be consecrated, that it may be to us for help and salvation and eternal life in the kingdom of heaven, through the grace of Christ.'

(c.) The priest subjoins :

'... Glory to Thee, my Lord, Who hast called me, a miserable sinner... that I may offer to Thee this one, holy, and acceptable sacrifice, which is the memorial of the Passion and Death, Burial and Resurrection of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, through Whom it pleased Thee to forgive the sins of all men.' *Censing the bystanders on the right, he adds :* 'Bless, my lords, and pray for me, my fathers and my brethren and my masters, that this oblation may be consecrated by my hands.'

Deacon and Congregation : 'May Christ hear thy prayers and receive thine oblation, and cause thy priesthood to stand before Him ; and may He be well pleased with this sacrifice, which thou offerest for thyself, for us, and for all the world, from the least to the greatest ; through Thy grace and love, for ever and ever. Amen.'

Priest : 'Yea, O Lord our God, look not on the multitude of my sins, nor let Thine Almighty power be wroth at their weight, but through Thine unspeakable grace consecrate this great sacrifice, and bestow it in value and power, that it may blot out our manifold sins. . . .'

(d.) After the *Sursum Corda*, the priest says :

'The oblation is offered to the Lord, the God of all.'

Choir : 'It is meet and right.'

(e.) After the words of Institution :

' . . . In this hour, wherein the sacrifice is offered to Thy Father, I beseech Thy grace to have mercy on all creatures. . . . Let this oblation be received for the whole Catholic Church and for priests and princes, &c. . . . Then, my Lord, according to Thine exceeding love, receive this best, and acceptable commemoration of the fathers who are godly and righteous and well-pleasing unto Thee, the memorial of the Body and Blood of Thy Christ, which we shall offer to Thee upon the pure and holy altar, as Thou hast taught us. . . . We therefore, my Lord, Thy weak and unprofitable servants, who are gathered together in Thy Name, and at this time stand before Thee, and by holy tradition have received a pattern from Thee, we glorify, exalt, and venerate, with joy and exultation, this memorial, and sacrifice this Mystery, great, awful, holy, and divine, of the Passion and Death, Burial and Resurrection, of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. . . . Send then, my Lord, Thy Holy Spirit, and let Him brood on this oblation of Thy servants, and hallow it, that it may be to us, my Lord, for the payment of our debts and the remission of our sins, and the great hope of resurrection from the dead, and a new life in the heavenly kingdom.'

(f.) After the censing of the Oblation, and before the Fraction, the Choir says :

'The ministers who do His will, Cherubim and Seraphim and Archangels, stand with fear and trembling before the altar, and behold the Priest, when He breaks and divides the Body of Christ for the propitiation of sin.'

(g.) Prayer before Communion :

'And now, O Lord, Thou Who hast vouchsafed that I should stand before this Thy pure and holy altar, to offer to Thee this loving and holy sacrifice, make us also worthy, through Thy love, that in all pureness and holiness we may receive the gift.'

(h.) At the priest's Communion, the deacon says :

'Let this oblation be received above in the heavenly places, together with that which Abel, Noah and Abraham offered to the heavenly kingdom.'¹

XI. *Mozarabic Liturgy.*

(a.) Offertory :

'Almighty, everlasting God, let this oblation be acceptable to Thy Majesty, which we offer for our sins and wickednesses, and for the

¹ This is probably one of the transpositions made by Archbishop Menezes at the Synod of Diamper, to make the Malabar rite more conformable to the Roman. The corresponding prayer in the Nestorian Liturgy is an occasional variant, and is placed by Renaudot in his Appendix to that rite, not in its proper order.

stability of the holy Catholic and Apostolic faith in believers, through Christ our Lord. In the Name,' &c.

'We offer to Thee, O Lord, the Cup for blessing the Blood of Christ Thy Son,¹ and beseech Thy mercy that it may ascend before the face of Thy Divine Majesty with a sweet-smelling savour. Through.

'We beseech Thee, O Lord, graciously accept this oblation, and pardon the sins of all the offerers, on whose behalf it is offered to Thee. Through.

'In the spirit of humility, and in a contrite mind, let us be received by Thee, O Lord, and let our sacrifice be so made that we may be received by Thee this day, and that it may please Thee, O Lord God.'

'Come, Holy Ghost the Sanctifier, sanctify this sacrifice prepared for Thee by my hands.'

(b.) Before the Commemoration of the Saints, the Priest says:

'Our Priests, the Roman Pope and others, offer oblation to the Lord God, for themselves and all the clergy, and the laity of the Church entrusted to them, and for the whole brotherhood. Furthermore, all the Priests, Deacons, Clerks, and lay folk standing around offer in honour of the Saints for them and theirs. *Choir*: They offer for themselves and for all the brotherhood.'

(c.) In the Canon, after the Post-Sanctus, the Priest says:

'Be present, be present, Jesu, Good Pontiff, in our midst, as Thou wast in the midst of Thy disciples; hal ✠ low this oblation ✠ that when hallowed ✠ we may receive it at the hands of Thy holy Angel; Holy Lord, and Everlasting Redeemer.'

XII. *Roman Liturgy.*

(a.) Offertory:

'Receive, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God, this immaculate Host, which I, Thine unworthy servant, offer to Thee, my Living and Very God, for my countless sins, and offences, and negligences, and for all those present, and also for all the Christian faithful, quick and dead, that it may avail to me and to them unto salvation in life everlasting.'

'We offer unto Thee, O Lord, the Cup of Salvation, beseeching Thy mercy, that it may ascend with a sweet savour before the face of Thy Divine Majesty, for our salvation and that of the whole world.'

'In the spirit of humility, and in a contrite mind, let us be received by Thee, O Lord, and let our sacrifice be so performed in Thy sight this day, that it may please Thee, O Lord God.'

'Come, Sanctifier, Almighty, Everlasting God, and ble ✠ ss this sacrifice prepared for Thy Holy Name.'

¹ Or, 'For the blessed Blood,' &c. The phrase is slightly ambiguous.

(b.) After the *Lavabo*:

'Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation, which we offer unto Thee in memorial of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of Jesus Christ our Lord: in honour of Blessed Mary ever Virgin, of blessed John Baptist, and of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and of all Saints, that it may avail for their honour and our salvation: and may they vouchsafe to intercede for us in heaven, whose memorial we make on earth. Through the same Christ our Lord, Amen.'

'Pray, brethren, that my and your sacrifice may be acceptable to God the Father Almighty.'

R. 'The Lord receive the sacrifice from thine hands to the praise and glory of His Name, to our profit also, and that of all His Holy Church: Amen.'

(c.) The *Secret*, varying with the season, e.g. Whitsun Day:

'Sanctify, O Lord, we beseech Thee, the offered gifts, and purify our hearts by the enlightening of the Holy Spirit. Through.'

(d.) At the beginning of the Canon of the Mass:

'We therefore humbly pray and beseech Thee, most merciful Father, through Jesus Christ Thy Son our Lord, to accept and bless these ✠ gifts, these ✠ offerings, these ✠ holy spotless sacrifices, which we offer to Thee in the first place for Thy Holy Catholic Church, the which vouchsafe to pacify, keep, unite, and rule throughout the world, together with Thy servant our Pope N. and our Bishop N., and all orthodox believers in the Catholic and Apostolic faith . . . Therefore this oblation of our service, and of Thy whole household, we beseech Thee to accept graciously, O Lord, and direct our days in Thy peace, and cause us to be delivered from eternal damnation and to be numbered in the flock of Thine elect. Through. Which oblation do Thou, O God, vouchsafe to make in all respects blessed, set apart, approved, reasonable and acceptable, that it may become unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most beloved Son our Lord Jesus Christ.'

(e.) After the Consecration:

'Whence we also, O Lord, Thy servants, and also Thy holy people, being further mindful of the blessed Passion and also of the Resurrection from the dead and of the glorious Ascension of the same Christ, Thy Son, offer to Thine august Majesty of Thine own gifts and bounties, a pure ✠ Host, a holy ✠ Host, an immaculate ✠ Host, the holy ✠ Bread of Eternal Life, and the Cup ✠ of Everlasting Salvation. Upon which vouchsafe to look with propitious and serene countenance, and to accept them, as Thou didst vouchsafe to accept the gifts of Thy righteous servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and the holy sacrifice and spotless oblation which Thine High Priest Melchizedek offered unto Thee.'

'We humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, command these to be borne by the hands of Thine holy Angel to Thine altar on high, in

presence of Thy Divine Majesty, that so many of us as in participation of Thine altar shall have received the Sacred Body and Blood of Thy Son may be fulfilled with all heavenly blessing and grace. Through the same.'

(f.) Post-Communion :

'Let this ministry of my service, O Holy Trinity, be pleasing unto Thee, and grant that the sacrifice which I unworthy have offered in sight of Thy Majesty may be acceptable unto Thee, and of Thy mercy be a propitiation for me and for all on whose behalf I have offered it. Through.'

XIII. *Syriac Ordo Communis.*

(a.) At the Introit :

'Grant, O Lord God . . . that we may stand honourably and purely before Thy holy altar, and discharging the priestly office, offer to Thee pure and excellent sacrifices in true faith . . . Hallow this oblation, and grant through it remission of sins and purging of offences unto them for whom it is offered, myself and my father, and unto all whose communion makes intercession together with me, the faithful, both quick and departed . . .'

(b.) At the Oblation :

'O God, mighty and marvellous for evermore, Who art wont to receive the sacrifices, vows, first-fruits, and tithes of Thy servants ; receive, O Lord, the oblations of Thy servants, which they have set apart and brought, for Thy love and Thy holy Name . . . *Censing the Bread, and placing it on the altar, the Priest adds:* He was brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before his shearers is dumb, so He opened not His mouth to him that afflicted Him.'

(c.) 'O God, Who didst accept the sacrifice of Abel in the field, of Noah in the ark, of Abraham on the mountain-top, of David in the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite, of Elijah on Mount Carmel, and the widow's mites in the Treasury ; accept, O Lord, these oblations which are offered unto Thee by my hands, weak and a sinner, and through them grant a good remembrance to the quick and dead, for whom they are offered, and bless the dwelling of those who offer them.'

(d.) Before the Epistle, the Deacon says :

'He Whom Moses beheld in the bush, and Ezekiel upon the chariot, is Himself placed upon the holy altar ; and the people receive Him, and live. Lo ! He, Whom Cherubim and Seraphim serve with great awe, is offered upon the altar, and the people receive Him, and live. God, Who of Thy mercy didst receive the sacrifice of righteous men of old, receive of Thy mercy our sacrifice, and accept our prayers.'

(e.) At the Commemoration of the Departed, the Priest says :

'O God, Thou art made a sacrifice, and sacrifice is offered unto Thee, receive this sacrifice from my sinful hands for the soul of N.'

(f.) At the *Lavabo* :

'Wash away, O Lord, the filth and defilements of my soul . . . that I may with a pure conscience offer to Thee a living sacrifice well-pleasing to Thy Godhead, and like to Thine own glorious sacrifice, O Lord our God, for ages of ages.'

(g.) Prayer at the Fraction :

'O Father of truth, behold Thy Son, a sacrifice well-pleasing unto Thee. Receive Him Who died for me, and for His sake be gracious unto me. Receive this sacrifice from my hands, that Thou mayest be favourable unto me, nor impute to me my sins, which I have committed before Thy Majesty. Behold the Blood shed on Golgotha by the ungodly, which intercedes for me : receive my prayer for its sake. As great as are my sins, so great are Thy mercies ; if Thou shouldst weigh Thy clemency, it would outweigh the mountains which Thou weighest in a balance. Look upon my sins, but at the same time look upon the sacrifice which is offered for them, for the sacrifice and victim is far greater than the guilt. For the sins which I have committed, Thy Beloved endured the nails and spear ; His sufferings are enough to appease Thee, and that I may live through them . . .'

(h.) At his own Communion, the Priest says :

'A propitiatory particle of the Body and Blood of the Christ of God is given to His weak and sinful servant for the pardon of offences, and the remission of sins in both worlds, for ever and ever. Amen.'

(i.) Post-Communion :

'Through the sacrifice which we have offered this day, may the Lord and His elect and holy Angels be propitiated, and through it may He grant rest and a good remembrance to His Mother and His Saints, and to all the faithful departed, especially to him for whom and on whose behalf this sacrifice has been offered.'

The thirteen Liturgies which have now been cited are the principal ones of the various families of rites, and are the normal types from which all the subsidiary ones, more than seventy in number, have been derived, so that it might suffice to give them only as specimens. But as not a few of the remainder contain additional matter of importance and interest, it is desirable to quote some of them also, restricting the citations to such passages as are not mere variants of any of the preceding, but embody some additional idea ; a rule which excludes, for example, the Ambrosian Missal, in this respect an unimportant variant of the Roman rite.

XIV. *Syriac Liturgy of S. Xystus of Rome.*

(a.) After the Elevation :

'Glory be to the Father Who hallowed, and to the Son Who was gracious, and to the Holy Spirit Who descended, and Who is the beginning, the ending, and the seal of all things which are and have been in heaven and in earth, Who flew down through His mercies, and descending by His clemency, came and consecrated our oblation, and sealed the Church and her sons through the great power of the Cross . . .'

(b.) 'Bless, O Lord, this oblation in the sanctuary, and bless the field whence it has been produced. Grant also rest to those, and spare those, on whose behalf it hath been offered and consecrated, for evermore.'

(c.) At the Fraction :

'Grant, O Lord, to my feeble hands, that they may draw near and break Thy holy Body, and that I may distribute it with true faith to the sons of Holy Church. Blessed art Thou, O Lord Jesu Christ, Living Bread which camest down from Thy heaven, and becamest life for evermore unto them which partake of Thee . . .'

XV. *Syriac S. Mark.*

(a.) Close of the Invocation :

'That these holy mysteries may be to us for the propitiation of sins and the remission of offences, to the possession of confidence before Thine awful throne, and for standing there without confusion, for the honour and edification of Thy Holy Church, and for the preservation of her children without sin . . .'

(b.) First Prayer of Bowing Down :

'O Lord God, I bow before Thee at this time . . . Receive from my hands this august and unbloody sacrifice, and lift up the horn of Thy Holy Church, spread throughout the world, and keep her orthodox pastors. . . . And be mindful, O Lord, of this divine sacrifice set before Thee ; of Thy clemency hallow us and perfect us through its benefits for the fulfilment of Thy good and quickening will ; and pardon those who shall communicate in these oblations, and save them through Thy love from all evils.'

(c.) Prayer before the *Sancta Sanctis* :

' . . . Grant that we may communicate in this sacrifice, now before Thee, and that it may be to us, and to all that partake thereof, for sanctification of body and soul, through.'

XVI. *Syriac S. Dionysius of Athens.*

(a.) Prayer after the Pax :

'Let us behold Thee unveiled, with our minds divinely enlightened, and feast at the table of Thy Kingdom, whilst we enjoy'

communion in this sacrifice set before us, and we ascribe to Thee glory and praise.'

(b.) After the words of Institution :

'Therefore, obedient to Thy precept, O Lord, continually celebrating in mystery the commemoration of Thy Death and Resurrection through this sacrifice, we look also for Thy second coming, the renewal of our nature, and the quickening of our mortality.'

(c.) After the Invocation :

'And so, according to the tradition and divine instructions of those who were spectators of Thy mysteries and interpreters of Thy wonders, we offer the Eucharist before Thee, O Lord, and thereby commemorate Thy love towards us, and the universal dispensation of Thine Only Begotten Son in this world, that Thou mayest thereby be mindful of Thy inherent and natural mercy . . . '

XVII. *Syriac S. Ignatius.*

(a.) After the Invocation :

'We, therefore, made worthy by the offering of these holy mysteries, and having the mind's eye enlightened by the knowledge of the truth, pray and beseech that these mysteries here presented may be to us, and to those who receive them, for quickening the watchfulness of the soul. . . . We make our prayer before Thee, O Lord, through this sacrifice which is perfected and fulfilled by the Holy Spirit, for Thy Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church . . . '

XVIII. *Syriac S. John Chrysostom.*

(a.) Prayer before the words of Institution :

'We do not offer fat oxen, nor do we sprinkle the blood of lambs, kids, or calves, on the horns of the altar, nor do we gird on crowns, belts, or ephods. For a Body hath come instead of a similitude, to wit, Thine Only Begotten Son, Who . . . in the same night when He was betrayed,' &c.

XIX. *Chaldee S. John Chrysostom.*

(a.) Post-Communion :

'Jesu Christ, our God, Who of Thine own will, and that of the Father and the Holy Ghost, hast been immolated for us, and hast fed us with Thy living Body, and given us to drink of Thy propitiatory Blood, confirm us in Thy love, fill us with Thy fear, stablish in us Thy faith, adorn us with unblamable conversation of life, and forgive our sins and those of the departed, that we may ever and at all times glorify Thee, and Thy Father, and the Holy Spirit, now and ever, &c.'

XX. *Syriac S. Cyril.*

(a.) After the Pax :

'Send therefore, O Lord, Thy grace, as well for our expiation and cleansing, as also for the acceptance and consummation of the pure and immaculate sacrifice, which we offer unto Thee for our sins, according to the quickening and gospel teaching of Christ, to Whom,' &c.

(b.) After the Invocation :

'Receive this our sacrifice, O Lord, which is offered unto Thee with mind, word, and thought, and chiefly for the tranquillity and peace of Thy Holy Church . . . '

(c.) Before the Pater Noster :

'Thy Son, Who, dwelling with us on earth, taught us the prayer to the Father and the sacrifice without spot. He was for us an acceptable oblation and a sweet odour, and He delivered unto us these holy and quickening mysteries.'

XXI. *Syriac John of Basra.*

(a.) After reciting the words of Institution, the priest continues :

'Thou, O Holy Pontiff . . . Sole Begotten Word of God . . . hast no need to offer daily many sacrifices, as they do who discharge an earthly priesthood. For this Thou didst once, not offering the blood of another, nor a sacrifice of corn, but gavest Thyself for us, and didst commit, because of Thy boundless goodness, a priestly ministry of like dignity to be established by the preachers of Thy Gospel.'

(b.) After the Invocation :

'Trusting only in Thy mercy and pity, which Thou hast abundantly shed on us, we venture to draw near to this awful and tremendous priestly ministry. We bring nothing from the ministry of the Law, containing nought save shadows, no ephod nor precious amice, no mitre, golden vial or tiara, no bullock offered whole, no goat for our sins, no ram without defect, no red heifer without blemish, no turtle-dove or pigeon ; but we offer unto Thee bread of pure flour mingled with oil and frankincense for a sweet odour ; for the blood of bulls and goats could not take away the sin of the world. For how could light immaterial, and above all substance, be obtained by us through material spices ? But of a truth, having put on Thy Beloved Son, Thine equal in power, glory, creation, and preservation of the things which be, through His goodness, most full of love to mankind, we offer Him the same to Thee as a sacrifice and oblation, spotless and pure, and make Him to be our joint petitioner . . . '

XXII. *Liturgy of Theodore the Interpreter (Nestorian).*

(a.) After the *Sursum Corda*, the priest adds :

'The living and reasonable oblation of our first-fruits, the unimolated and acceptable offering of the Son of our race, is offered to God, the Lord of all, for all His creatures in all places.'

(b.) Prayer of Bowing Down :

'We offer before Thy glorious Trinity, with contrite heart and humble spirit, this living and holy sacrifice, which is the mystery of the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world ; praying Thee, and making supplication before Thee, that Thine adorable Godhead, O Lord, may be gracious, and through Thy mercy this pure and holy oblation for the sins of the world, whereby Thou art appeased and reconciled, may be accepted.'

XXIII. *Æthiopic S. Dioscorus.*

(a.) Invocation :

'Send that Spirit on this Bread and Cup. Let the Lamb come, and let us behold Him in the camp, that we may immolate Him, and rejoice in Him. Nor let it seem to any one of us that this Body which he eateth is a body without blood and spirit. Nor when he drinks this Cup, that it is blood without body and spirit. But the Body is blood and spirit, and is furthermore His Godhead, which is united with His Manhood.'¹

XXIV. *Alexandrine S. Gregory.*

Prayer of Dismissal :

'We sinners, and Thine unworthy servants, go from strength to strength, being counted worthy to minister at Thine holy Altar, and having offered unto Thee the unbloody sacrifice, the immaculate Body and the precious Blood of the great God our Saviour Jesus Christ, to Thy glory.'

It is not undesirable, before proceeding to offer any comments on this catena, to append in parallel columns the three Anglican Rites in which the same teaching is exhibited, namely, the Book of 1549, the Scottish Office of 1792, as issued by Bishops Skinner and Horsley, and the American Office now in use.

BOOK OF 1549.	SCOTTISH.	AMERICAN.
O God, heavenly Father, Which of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine only Son, Jesus Christ, to suffer death on the Cross for our redemption, Who made there (by His one oblation once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world,	All glory be to Thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that Thou, of Thy tender mercy, didst give Thy only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption ; Who (by His one Oblation of Himself once offered) made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and sa-	All glory be to Thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that Thou, of Thy tender mercy, didst give Thy only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption ; Who (by His one Oblation of Himself once offered) made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and sa-

¹ This Liturgy, printed (from a MS. belonging to Edward Pococke) at the end of Wansleb's edition of Ludolf's *Æthiopic Lexicon* (London 1661), represents a very ancient norm, and has been thought by Bunsen to be probably the oldest one surviving.

BOOK OF 1549.

and did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to celebrate, a perpetual memory of that His precious death until His coming again; hear us (O merciful Father), we beseech Thee; and with Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ, Who in the same night that He was betrayed, took bread, and when He had blessed and given thanks, He brake it and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take eat, this is My Body which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of Me. Likewise after Supper He took the Cup, and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of Me.

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we Thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make: having in remembrance His blessed passion, mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension; rendering to Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits preserved unto us by the same, entirely desiring Thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the merits and death of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, and through faith

SCOTTISH.

tisfaction for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue, a Perpetual Memorial of that, His precious Death and Sacrifice, until His coming again. For, in the night that He was betrayed, He took bread, and when He had given thanks, He brake it and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take, eat, THIS IS MY BODY, WHICH IS GIVEN FOR YOU: Do this in remembrance of Me. Likewise, after Supper, He took the Cup, and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for THIS IS MY BLOOD OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, WHICH IS SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS: DO this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of ME.

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we Thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath commanded us to make: having in remembrance His blessed passion and precious death, His mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension. And we most humbly beseech Thee, O merciful Father, to hear us, and of Thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with Thy Word and Holy Spirit, these Thy gifts and creatures of Bread and Wine, that they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly be-

AMERICAN.

tisfaction for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue, a Perpetual Memorial of that, His precious Death and Sacrifice, until His coming again. For, in the night that He was betrayed, He took bread, and when He had given thanks, He brake it and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is My Body, which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of Me. Likewise, after Supper, He took the Cup, and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of Me.

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we Thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath commanded us to make; having in remembrance His blessed passion and precious death, His mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension. And we most humbly beseech Thee, O merciful Father, to hear us, and of Thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with Thy Word and Holy Spirit, these Thy gifts and creatures of Bread and Wine, that we, receiving them according to Thy Son our Saviour, Jesus

BOOK OF 1549.	SCOTTISH.	AMERICAN.
<p>in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion. And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee : humbly beseeching Thee that whosoever shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and be made one Body with Thy Son, Jesus Christ, that He may dwell in them and they in Him. And although we be unworthy (through our manifold sins) to offer unto Thee any sacrifice ; yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, and command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of Thy holy Angels, to be brought up into Thy holy tabernacle before the sight of Thy Divine Majesty, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Christ our Lord, by Whom and with Whom in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto Thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.</p>	<p>loved Son. And we earnestly desire Thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion. And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee ; beseeching Thee, that whosoever shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and be made one Body with Thy Son, Jesus Christ, that He may dwell in them, and they in Him. And although we are unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto Thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord ; by Whom and with Whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto Thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.</p>	<p>Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood. And we earnestly desire Thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion. And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee ; humbly beseeching Thee, that whosoever shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and be made one Body with Thy Son, Jesus Christ, that He may dwell in them, and they in Him. And although we are unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto Thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord ; by Whom and with Whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto Thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.</p>

The first observation to be made on the extracts from ancient Liturgies tabulated above is that, although it has been necessary, for the sake of brevity, and to facilitate comparison, to represent them by very brief and isolated quotations, such a method is highly unfavourable to a just estimate of their sacrificial tone and character. It is only by taking the whole of each rite in its integrity, that its full meaning can be fairly

seen, and the structural sequence of its parts fully understood: a rule especially true of S. Mark's and the Clementine Liturgy, which do not yield many separate illustrative clauses. And the notable fact which forces itself on the student's attention is that, fervent and devout as is that part of their language which relates to the act of communion—often very much more so than in our English rite—yet the oblation is in every instance the prominent idea throughout, the sacerdotal offering of bread and wine, which are presented that, by Divine power, they may become the Body and Blood of Christ, and then be pleaded as intercessory and propitiatory, in power and effect, for quick and dead; while the communion is consequently treated as being 'a feast upon a Sacrifice,' to use Cudworth's apt phrase. There is not one single liturgy in the whole number which suggests, or is so much as patient of, the interpretation that the offering made is a mere oblation of the fruits of the earth, analogous to that of a harvest thanksgiving, or that the feast is an *agape*, or club-meal of Christian fellowship; although both these views have been adduced and defended with some pertinacity at no distant date.

Another fact which the rubrics decide, on a comparative view, is the restriction to the Bishop or priest of the power of offering. Of course, in a sense, this is a mere truism, for no one supposes that the usage was otherwise by the end of the fourth century, at any rate. But there is no survival the other way observable in so much as a trace. In some of the Western Churches, the text Acts vi. 2, guided the practice so far that the deacons 'served the table,' by bringing the oblations and setting them on the altar; but their ministry ended there, and was merely subordinate, and, so to speak, mechanical; nor in the earliest witness to this practice, S. Isidore of Seville,¹ A.D. 636, is more implied. But not even so much meets the view in the Oriental Liturgies (save for a slight fluctuation in the Nestorian use), whose rule it is that the priest alone can even place the elements on the altar, which the deacon in some cases, but not in all, brings to him for that purpose. There are frequent references in the various forms of the Great Intercession to those who have offered, not only the actual oblations then on the Altar (as to which the wording is indeterminate, and does not clearly define whether direct purveyance of the Bread and Wine, or simply union in the immediate act of worship, be intended), but tithes, alms, or other gifts. But there is not any provision in the rubrics or prayers of

¹ *De Eccl. Off.* ii. 8, iii. 19.

any of the existing liturgies, except those of the Anglican rite, for making such offerings in direct connexion with the Holy Eucharist ; though it is held by not a few scholars that the rite of the *Lavabo*, as it now stands in the Roman Missal, after, and not before, the oblation of Bread and Wine, is a survival of some such practice, as the hand-washing was necessitated by the priest having anciently to present various offerings in kind besides the Bread and Wine, some of which, as, for example, oil and honey, would be apt to soil his hands by contact. But so far as we can fairly conjecture, all such oblations, though still offered upon the altar, were separated at a very early time from the Liturgy. The practical bearing of these remarks on the present question is that they refute a theory which has been advanced within the last few years, that the presentation of alms is one of the chief quasi-sacrificial elements of the ancient Liturgies, a view of which it may not unfairly be said that it never could have crossed the mind of any one who had read a single ancient Liturgy through with attention.

Another very important consideration is that there is no evidence at all of any growth or development of the sacrificial idea. Some few of the extant Liturgies are known to belong to a comparatively modern period, such as that of Gregory Abulfaraj or Bar-Hebræus, about A.D. 1280, and the Lesser S. James, compiled so recently as 1591, by Gregory, Catholic of the East. And all the three chief Western rites, Roman, Ambrosian, and Mozarabic, have been unquestionably altered at a date subsequent to that of nearly all the Eastern forms. But they exhibit no advance in fulness or precision of expression : rather, in truth, the reverse (since the particular collects of oblation in the present Roman Missal, now obligatory, were variable till about A.D. 1150, and are not so clear as many of the merely occasional *secretæ*) ; while some of the very oldest Liturgies we have, such as S. James, S. Adæus and Maris, and Malabar, are very copious ; whereas the later derivatives of S. James, notably the Constantinopolitan Liturgy, are much less so. And what is perhaps more curious still, and the most complete refutation of any theory as to gradual degeneration, is the fact that the later Æthiopic rites, in use where a debased and highly Judaizing form of Christianity prevails, exhibit no change in this respect, but present the doctrine just as it appears in the earlier Greek and Syriac forms.

This principle holds good also for words and acts of Eucharistic adoration, explicitly addressed to Christ as present under the sacramental veils. It is the Roman Missal which is poor-

est of all in this respect; whereas the Clementine Liturgy, that of S. James, the Syriac *Ordo Communis*, the Nestorian rite, the Coptic S. Gregory, S. Basil, and S. Cyril, and the Armenian, agree in using very full and strong language on the subject; while the Greek S. Basil and S. John Chrysostom are weaker than their own norm, S. James. And although there is no need to give illustrative citations in the present paper, as not directly concerned with the question of worship, a general reference to the fact has its value, as helping to prove the very slight amount of doctrinal change which has taken place in the Liturgies since their first construction in a very remote age of Christianity. Indeed, the invocations of the Blessed Virgin and the Cherubic Hymn in S. James and elsewhere, are almost the only passages which we can confidently signalize as later interpolations.

On the other hand, the wording of these Liturgies does not imply any repetitious or suppletory act of sacrifice in the Eucharist, as in any sense apart from the one Oblation on the Cross. A cavil has been sometimes made by Ultramontanes and Puritans alike against the Anglican Prayer of Consecration, as it now stands, because of the clause, 'Who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world,' as though this were meant to shut out, and did in fact shut out, any doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice higher than Waterland's. It is true that the most eminent Roman Catholic divines, as, for instance, Möhler in his *Symbolik*, repudiate emphatically the notion that there is, or can be, any other true expiatory sacrifice than that of Calvary; but it is also true that this particular idea is nowhere expressly declared in the Ordinary and Canon of the Roman Missal, so that a contrary teaching has often been prevalent, even though unauthorized, in the Latin obedience, and is by no means extinct even now. Consequently it has been held that the Anglican rite, by inserting such a clause, meant to express its divergence, not merely from the popular current opinions 'Romanensium,' but from the structure and intent of the Missal itself, and thereby, further, the like divergence, by implication, from all those other ancient rites with which the Missal is practically agreed.

A few citations from some leading types will serve to refute this plea, as they occur in liturgies which leave no possibility of doubt with regard to their sacrificial intention.

1. *Syriac S. Dionysius of Athens.*

'This sacrifice, celebrated there, we commemorate unto Thee, O

Lord, and those sufferings which Thou didst endure for us upon the Cross.'

2. *Syriac John of Basra.*

See above, XXI. *a*, which is a very close parallel to the idea expressed in the Common Prayer, but even more strongly worded.

3. *Ambrosian Missal.*

Preface for Easter Eve:

'Who hast dedicated the Passover of all nations . . . by the Blood and Body of Thine Only-Begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ . . . that one Victim, once by Himself offered to Thy Majesty, might expiate the sin of the whole world.'

But, in truth, it is not so much isolated phrases, like the foregoing, which express this doctrine of the oneness of the sacrifice on Calvary, as the manner in which the great majority of the Liturgies describe the action of the priest as one of *commemoration*, a term which in strictness excludes either repetition or suppletion.

There is another respect wherein a careful examination of the Ancient Liturgies and of patristic teaching serves to minimize the force of an objection often brought against the existing English Communion Office, wherein the Prayer of Oblation, instead of being united with the Prayer of Consecration, as in the Scottish and American rites, is separated from it by the communion of priest and people, and by the Our Father. It may be readily admitted that the Scottish Office is the nearest of all living Western rites to the primitive model, and superior alike to the English and to its own American daughter, which is less precise as to the effect of consecration, since Bishop Seabury's draft Office, which followed it exactly in this particular, was altered more in conformity with the English form in this one place. And if any serious recasting of the Anglican Office were to take place, it would be difficult for any liturgical student to deny that the Scottish Liturgy ought to serve as the norm for reconstruction. Nevertheless, that severance of the consecration and the oblation, which is a peculiarity of our existing rite, does bring out into especial prominence one highly important aspect of Eucharistic truth. It is to be noted that our Prayer of Oblation contains a clause, based on S. Paul's language in Romans xii. 1, to this effect: 'And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee.' These words have been perverted by Waterland as, so to speak, exhausting the

highest meaning in which sacrifice is predicable of the Eucharist ; but fuller consideration leads to a different conclusion. In S. Augustine's treatise *De Civitate Dei*, there are several references made to a sacrifice of the body of the Church as an oblation to God in the Liturgy :

'The whole redeemed City, that is, the congregation and fellowship of the Saints, is offered as a universal sacrifice to God by the High Priest, Who also offered Himself in passion for us, that we might be the body of so great a Head ; according to the form of a servant. This he offered, in this He was offered, because according to this He is the Mediator, in this the Priest, in this the Sacrifice. When therefore the Apostle exhorts us to present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is our reasonable service . . . this is the Christian sacrifice, "for we being many, are one body in Christ." Which the Church habitually does in the Sacrament of the Altar, well known to the faithful . . . since in that thing which she offers, she is offered herself.'—x. 6.

'Through this [sacrifice] He is a Priest, Himself the offerer, Himself likewise the oblation. Of which thing the Church willed the daily sacrifice to be the sacrament, for she, being the Body of Him the Head, learns to offer herself through Him.'—x. 20.

This notion appears in the following prayer before the Oblation, in one of the variants of the Syriac *Ordo Communis* :

'O Lamb, pure without blemish, Who didst offer Thyself as an acceptable Sacrifice to the Father, for the salvation and propitiation of the whole world ; grant unto us that we may offer ourselves as a living sacrifice unto Thee, which may be well-pleasing unto Thee, and be like unto Thy sacrifice for us, O Christ, our God, for ever and ever.'

But the Apostle teaches us that communion in the Holy Eucharist is the efficient cause of our membership in the Body of Christ, saying : 'We, being many, are one bread, and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread.' 1 Cor. x. 17.

And the second Post-Communion of the English Office expresses the same idea in this wise :

'Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, and dost assure us thereby . . . that we are very members incorporate in the mystical Body of Thy Son, which is the blessed Company of all faithful people.'

But whereas the Great Oblation, the presentation of the Body and Blood of Christ, is effected in the Consecration Prayer, and would be complete were the service to break off at its close ; the minor and subordinate oblation, that of our-

selves, cannot properly take place save in and through Eucharistic participation, since it is only in union with Christ that we become a fit or possible oblation to Almighty God, because then united with His dearly beloved Son. And Waterland's view, which excludes this idea, is therefore, as remarked at the beginning of this paper, pre-eminently unevangelical, for it assumes the possibility of a sacrifice to God apart from, and therefore additional to, the one offering of Christ. On this head it is well to cite Prebendary Sadler's weighty language :

'We, as sinners needing mediation, cannot offer anything to God except in and through that Mediator whom He has provided, and the Eucharist is the Church's expression of this. If we offer ourselves, it is not as in any sense an independent offering, but simply as forming part of that Mystical Body to which, in the Eucharist, the faithful are united, and so are held by God to be in Christ and offered in Himself when He presents Himself at the Right Hand of God. To make (as some seem to desire to do) this offering of ourselves to be the principal feature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, or an independent part of it, or one of a number of sacrifices of which the Eucharist is composed, is simply to rob the Eucharist of its evangelical character, and in fact, to destroy the whole meaning and intent of the institution of sacrificial worship.'—*One Offering*, chap. xiv.

Now, it is this doctrine which our existing Liturgy brings into great salience by interposing the communion of the people between the Consecration and the Prayer of Oblation. There is no interruption or suspension of the great sacrificial Act, but the full accomplishment of the rite in its integrity requires that we must be offered too, in and with Christ, and that postulates our previous incorporation with Him. And it is not too much to say that, if such had been the structure of ancient Liturgies in general, while the older form, as exhibited in the Book of 1549, the Scottish, and the American rites, were the innovation, there would have been an outcry raised against such an obscuring of a great evangelical and liturgical truth, an outcry far louder, and with more reason on its side, than that which practically has been occasioned by our office as it stands.

And it may be interesting to point out that this very view, for which we are contending, is actually discoverable in some ancient Liturgies. We will cite two, wherein the Post-Communion Prayers contain, first an explicit statement of the benefits derived from partaking, and then a closing act of oblation based thereon.

In the Liturgy of Jacob Baradaëus, long after the Great
VOL. XI.—NO. XXI. K

Oblation is over, and near the close of the office, the Priest says a prayer of thanksgiving, thus :

'We offer our due thanksgiving to Thine incomprehensible majesty, O Lord, because of this salvation which Thou hast bestowed on us, through Thine Only-Begotten Son, Who from the beginning, before the foundations of the world, made ready this mystery hidden from generations and from ages, which is revealed and given unto us who are weak and feeble. We offer Him to Thee as intercessor for us, that in Him and through Him we may be delivered from condemnation and the Judgment to come, and be made worthy of the splendid crowns of glory of the Blessed, and together with them we ascribe glory and praise to Thine Only-Begotten Son and to Thy Holy Spirit.'

And on this follows another thanksgiving to Christ for having united us with His Body and Blood. The connexion is the same as in the English Liturgy, though the order is different. But even the same order is preserved in the Liturgy of Michael of Antioch. There are two Post-Communion thanksgivings, followed by a benedictory prayer, which bring out very clearly the notion we are discussing, thus :—

1. 'Glory to Thy mercy, O Lord, Whose grace has been poured out so abundantly. We give thanks to Thy Name, and bless Thy glory, because Thou hast made us, albeit rolled in the mire, worthy of drawing the water of life from this pure and holy fount. We beseech Thee, O Lord, to conserve within us this mighty and precious deposit, that through it and for its sake we may be delivered from condemnation in the Judgment on that great day of the resurrection of all men, and be made sure for ever before Thee at this spiritual banquet, and sing perfectly [the praise of] God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.'

2. 'We offer special thanksgiving with praise and joy unto Thee, O Lord, for Thy bounties and gifts, inexpressible by words, for that Thou hast made us worthy of this Divine gift. Condemn us not because of the reception of Thy spotless mysteries, but have mercy on Thy sinful servants, and heal the wounds of Thy people ; receive the supplications of Thy flock, and let us all receive remission through this sacrifice. Let it be unto us for pardon and salvation of our souls and bodies, and ward off from us that ghostly deceiver, and all kind of sin. Let Thy right hand rest upon us, Christ our God, and Thy Cross keep us, and we ascribe glory,' &c.

3. 'God, Who received the oblation of Abel in the field, and of Noah in the ark, of Abraham on the mountain-top, of Elijah on Carmel, of David in the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite, and the widow's mites in the Sanctuary ; Himself accept your oblations, your vows and tithes, and the works of your hands, and grant a good remembrance to your departed ones, a blessed hope and guardianship unto your life, through.'

It may be just added here that some of the Liturgies are much more precise than the two just cited, in defining the effect of communion as incorporation with Christ, and the prayer of thanksgiving from the Syriac S. John Chrysostom may well be given in illustration :—

‘What have we, O Lord, which we can repay Thee for all Thy bounties towards us, and for all Thy gifts, and bounties, and benefits towards us? Thou Who hast made us worthy of communicating in the Body of Thy Son, and of receiving the Cup of Salvation, His precious and saving Blood. Now, therefore, O Lord, good and loving, as Thou hast called us and led us to these blessed and quickening dainties, vouchsafe that the Body of Thine Only-Begotten Son may be mingled with our bodies, and His Blood mingled with our souls, and may be unto us for the pardon of sins, the remission of offences, food for the way of eternal life, a driving away of the devil, and for sanctification of bodies and souls, for Thou art blessed, O God, and Thy Kingdom is holy, and we ascribe glory to Thee,’ &c.

So much will suffice to have said as to the Eucharistic teaching of the ancient Liturgies, and their relation to our own rite; but the caution, already given, must be repeated, against supposing that the whole of what they assert or imply can be presented in mere extracts. Not only do the gems require to be seen in their original setting, instead of in the detached fashion necessarily adopted in a catena, but the cumulative effect of thirty or forty liturgies, saying the same thing in nearly the same words, is of course lost when only illustrative specimens are selected from the various families. But the testimony of all agrees in the great central doctrine that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is the perpetual commemoration, presentation, and pleading of the Body and Blood of Christ, verily and indeed present in mystery, and offered as a propitiation for quick and dead, by the earthly priest, in direct connexion and union with His own High Priestly ministration within the veil in the heavenly places; and that all other acts or words of oblation in the rite are subordinate to, and inextricably bound up with, His one offering.

ART. VI.—LIFE OF RICHARD WALDO SIBTHORP.

Richard Waldo Sibthorp: A Biography; told chiefly in his own Correspondence. By Rev. J. FOWLER, M.A., Chaplain-warden of St. Anne's Bede-House Charity, Lincoln. (London, 1880.)

WE have become, unfortunately, in these latter days so familiar with the announcement that such and such a person has 'gone over to Rome,' that many of us, perhaps, have come almost unconsciously to think this a matter of but trifling importance. Such an opinion, however, will not stand for a moment the test of serious thought and consideration. To change from the English Church to the Roman is, assuredly, whether right or wrong, a most portentous act. It is to give the lie to the whole previous life, to pour contempt upon the most cherished and sacred ties, to degrade to an unsanctified and graceless condition those previously held to be entitled to the highest veneration and esteem, to pour contempt on the mother that bare us, and to lower her to the level of a sect. It is well said in a work, which we believe will do more than any book published of late years to save us from these deplorable oscillations, 'To change one's religion, or even one's communion, is a very serious and solemn, nay, a very awful step to take, whatever that religion may be. On the face of things it at least looks like revolt against God's will, since we were born and reared in our first creed without any act or choice of our own, and just as He was pleased to ordain for us.'¹ This century, it is said, has witnessed about three thousand secessions from the Anglican to the Roman Communion, of which about one-tenth have been those of English clergymen. We have no statistics for testing the number of changes in the other direction, but the amount has also been considerable. Many, too, of those who had gone from Anglicanism to Romanism have returned. What are we to say of these things? Is it that in these latter days there is an amount of unchastened levity, a looseness of hold of any form of creed not known before? Or, is it that there is an unbridled licence of individualism, self-reliance, and self-assertion? Or is it, again, that there is such an earnest craving for spiritual food and sustenance,

¹ Dr. Littledale's *Plain Reasons*, *ap. init.*

that men and women are ready to make any sacrifice if they think that by so doing they shall obtain a fuller supply? We believe this latter to be the principal immediate cause of secessions from England to Rome: and we boldly state that if it were a true belief, it is not a sufficient cause; and, secondly, that it is not true. No doubt, many a mechanic labouring hard to procure sufficient support for his family in this land might relieve himself from a considerable amount of toil and trouble, and easily reach comparative affluence, by deserting them and emigrating to Australia or America. His 'secession,' however, would hardly be justified by his increased prosperity. Supposing, however, the said mechanic to have persuaded himself that it was 'his duty to better himself,' and so to have departed regardless of his family ties, and then to find that he could not get any work in the land of his adoption, and to be reduced almost to starvation: in that case, his views would perhaps change as to the virtue of his first proceeding. The Romish Church has constructed a religion calculated with much skill to please a great variety of tastes, and to satisfy many spiritual appetites. It looks to the eyes of many infinitely fascinating from a distance. They are lured nearer and nearer. At length they spring across the chasm, and find disillusion. It is not to be supposed that the number of Anglicans who have returned from Rome after seceding represent really the number of those who have found their secession an awful mistake. By far the greater part (we know not whether to say the wiser) have elected to stay, and to make the best of what they have deliberately accepted. In that little book which so touchingly portrays some of the miseries springing out of these secessions, we read the following:—

'Had Eustace any wish to return to the Anglican Church, or to be restored to it in death?' 'Oh, no,' replied F.; 'his perceptions were much too keen of the solemnly binding nature of the change we have made, to admit such a thought. For myself, I confess that a time was when my mind would wander back almost in regretful desires towards that long-loved home; but A. set so clearly before me the reality of our position—having been placed by Providence in one state, and having deliberately chosen for ourselves another—that a repetition of such free choice and dedication is morally impossible; that we must go forward now steadily and trustingly or we are lost. The subject has long ceased to be even adverted to between us.'¹

Whether this is good logic or good divinity we are not

¹ *From Oxford to Rome*, p. 165.

concerned to inquire ; it is, probably, the way in which many who have made the change and regretted it think and reason.

The important subject of change of churches is strikingly illustrated by the life of Richard Waldo Sibthorp. This biography, ably put together by Mr. Fowler, gives us the curious record of four, if not five, changes of church and ecclesiastical position. In his early days, when an undergraduate at Magdalen, Mr. Sibthorp suddenly disappeared from Oxford with the deliberate intention of joining the Church of Rome. He says himself, 'In early life I sought admission into that Church, and but for the interference of the law, being then under age, should have joined her.'¹ He was brought back, and appears completely to have discarded the notion of seceding. In due course he took Anglican orders, and soon showed himself a decided member of the Evangelical school. His great eloquence as a preacher, his intense earnestness, the rapture of devotion in which he appeared to be held, impressed his hearers marvellously. In Lincolnshire, at Hull, in London, at Ryde, he was a most powerful instrument for moving men's hearts. His sermons, strikingly original, and delivered with great wealth of language and solemnity of manner, made no transient mark. There are some still alive who testify to effects caused by them sixty years ago. Then, in the midst of a most successful career, and the most unbounded popularity at Ryde, came a sudden change ; a change, we are bound to say, not in the least degree satisfactorily accounted for in this volume. His biographer thinks that he was not much influenced by the 'Tracts for the Times,' and speaks of 'other causes ;'² but what these other causes were he does not tell us, save only to suggest a very strange cause indeed, namely, that Mr. Sibthorp was not satisfied with the correspondence of the Church of England with 'Levitical types.'³ As it stands in this volume, Mr. Sibthorp's second secession to Rome is unexplained and unjustified. We are thus driven to look for an explanation to the special character of the man as well as to the character of that school of theology to which he had so ardently attached himself. In character, Mr. Sibthorp was eminently devout, tenderly charitable, and loving. But he was deficient in the qualities of a masculine mind. He had

¹ *Life*, p. 17.

² *Ibid.* p. 57.

³ *Ibid.* p. 55. This was the main cause put forward by Mr. Sibthorp himself, in his defence, but he afterwards acknowledged that he wrote rashly, and that it was no sufficient cause.

not a firm and catholic grasp of truth. He dwelt much upon little things. He seems to have supposed that the world was to stand still, and that churches were to have no growth, and to learn nothing. Thus, he was troubled about the impossibility of addressing an epistle to the 'Church in Manchester,'¹ and to the last, though he always loved it, he persistently regarded the Church of England as an establishment. Mr. Sibthorp, in fact, as his biographer freely admits, had never grasped the position of the Anglican Church as a branch of the true Catholic Church in England. Hence, all his utterances as to her, all his views of her, are somewhat petty and unsatisfactory. His character is not to be regarded in the light of that of a theologian or divine, but in that of a saint. With his words ever pleading for Christ, his tender thoughtfulness, his open hand, his loving heart, this character, whether he was Anglican or Roman, rightly attaches to him; and, as his biographer well says—'It cannot fail to be a gain to spiritual religion, to see something of the martyr-like conscientiousness, the saintly self-abasement, the desire to be wholly like Christ, which shine through all his letters that have been preserved.'²

The instability displayed by Mr. Sibthorp may also have been partly due to the character of that school of theology which had influenced and formed his mind. Strange to say, one of the most fruitful sources of Romanist converts has been the Evangelical movement. This assertion will be dismissed by many as absurd: but what say the facts? Cardinal Newman has told us, in his *Apologia*, that he was originally under the influence of this school. Cardinal Manning had been in the strictest sense a member of it. Sibthorp, Ryder, Simeon, Dodsworth, Hope-Scott, Dikes, Noel, many others, had in their beginnings of religious earnestness belonged to the Evangelicals. The three sons of Mr. Wilberforce who apostatized came from the purest Evangelical source. 'These men drew scores, ay, hundreds, in their train, and of all these leaders it must be said, that as they proceeded from Oxford (so to speak) to Rome, so they had already marched from Clapham to Oxford.'³ It is true that all these men, with the exception of Mr. Sibthorp,

¹ *Life*, p. 50. 'For how,' said he, 'could an epistle be sent to the Church in Manchester? To whom could it be addressed?' We would suggest the Bishop, a sufficiently vigorous representative.

² *Ibid.* p. 3.

³ Mr. Gladstone, 'The Evangelical Movement,' *British Quarterly Review*, July 1879.

entered Rome, not direct from the Evangelicals, but after passing through the intermediate condition of Tractarianism. But so remarkable a phenomenon in the history of religious thought as is exhibited by their origin certainly deserves close attention.¹

The Evangelical proper is a man who bounds off into spiritualism with an eager and defiant zeal, utterly contemning restraints and checks to what he believes to be the voice of God within him. He is essentially a law unto himself. His rules are drawn from inward convictions. His religion is entirely subjective. He may or may not move in consonance with outward authority; but it is not the authority that directs him. He has the principle of lawlessness, though it may be exhibited in a perfectly harmless manner. His characteristic is individualism. He acts perhaps with a coterie of men like-minded with himself, but he does not act as a member of a body. Even in his joint actions, it is a union of forces, not a combination. He is still a law to himself, though his law may coincide with the laws of others. He would think it wrong, nay impious, to sacrifice opinions to corporate requirements, or, in other words, to submit himself to the Church. Now if this be the natural temper of Evangelicalism, it is easy to see how it may prepare the ground for the reception of Romanism. Suppose a conviction intellectually established that Romish pretensions are true, or that Rome offers higher aids to the spiritual life; then, a man accustomed to the self-pleasing of Evangelicalism accepts it at a bound. The authority of his own Church is really no bar to him. He believes that he sees the light, and rushing onwards towards it takes no heed of any intervening obstacles.

Mr. Sibthorp was certainly rash in running off to the Church of Rome, as his speedy return to Anglicanism sufficiently proved. Of course, of his conscientiousness there can be no question. He was not indeed called upon to make sacrifices such as many have endured. He had no wife. He had ample means. But it was a sore thing to him doubtless to incur the rebuke and disapproval of his friends, and to have to defend his position against numerous assaults. Dr. Newman it seems could make a joke of the matter,² but not so

¹ Mr. Sibthorp himself, observing on this point, says:—‘perhaps not so much to be wondered at, considering the total absence of Church principles in that body.’—*Life*, p. 117.

² On hearing that Mr. Sibthorp was going to Oscott, Dr. Newman said to him, ‘Mind you don’t stop there;’ and when he had returned he said, ‘Sibthorp was just like the fox that had lost its tail, and now wished all other foxes to suffer the same loss.’—*Life*, p. 63 *note*.

Mr. Sibthorp's Evangelical friends, who rained pamphlets upon him to which he was called to reply.¹ The sensation indeed produced by this defection was very great. From his prominent position at Ryde, and the fame of his preaching, Mr. Sibthorp was very widely known. Conversions to Rome at that period, before the great harvest from the Tractarians, were rare. As to secessions of prominent English clergymen, you might almost count them on your fingers. Looking a long way back, you might find a Dean of Windsor and a Master of the Savoy who had turned his back upon us: but then he was a Roman Archbishop before his arrival here, and probably a pretended Anglican throughout.² In the next reign you might find one, who afterwards proved himself to be a most acute controversialist against Rome, succumbing in his earlier days to Roman influences;³ and a little later a bishop—an eccentric one, it is true—but a man not without some fine qualities, perplexing and angering his generation by his Roman fancies.⁴ During the troubles, the soul of good Dean Cosin was vexed by the apostasy of many of the exiled Cavaliers; but their bitter hatred of Puritanism, and their feeling for help among the continental nations, may well explain this. More creditable to English constancy is the determined resistance made to Jesuit wiles when a Romish prince was on the throne of England, during which time, according to Evelyn, no considerable convert was made. The few clergy who seceded were poor time-servers. Creditable also in a high degree is the constancy of the non-jurors, who, with every inducement to secede to Rome, remained faithful to Anglicanism to a man. We are not aware of any important instances of clerical secession during the eighteenth century; and when the awakening of the Church of England took place, it was not in this direction that the movement tended, at any rate at first. Mr. Sibthorp's case was therefore exceedingly startling to the Church of England, and it was no less strikingly grateful to the Church of Rome. They could

¹ *Life*, p. 67.

² Marc Anthony de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalato, in the States of Venice, pretended to be converted by King James's writings, came to England, was loaded with preferment, but was lured back by Rome with the promise of greater wealth, and fell a victim to the Inquisition. He wrote books to explain both his coming and going. He was mercilessly handled by R. Crakanthorp, in the *Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*.

³ William Chillingworth, who has published a full account of his conversion and reconversion in his *Case*.

⁴ Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester. See the two volumes of his *Memoirs*, edited by Mr. Brewer.

not make enough of the new convert at Birmingham. He was 'very much worked at church openings, and suchlike occasions where money was needed, and eloquent appeals seemed likely to procure it.'¹ His eccentricities were readily condoned. 'He was spoken of as the "spoiled convert," whom to retain much must be conceded.' His sermons had not in them a trace of Romanism. He did not shrink from saying that he wished none to follow him in the step that he had taken. His biographer infers, not unfairly, that he must oftentimes have been a sore trial to his co-religionists. 'He was rich, he was eloquent, he was popular, he was eminently useful to the cause which he had adopted; but he could scarcely be called submissive, and his orthodoxy was not above suspicion.'² He was striving to get spiritual good and profit in his new position. 'I would know but one thing,' he writes, 'Christ crucified; and I do find I am in a position to learn Him, if it be not my own fault.' But doubts as to whether this was really the case came upon him. The disillusion had commenced. He retired from Birmingham. 'I resolved,' he writes, 'to go into retirement, and leisurely reconsider the step I took (certainly hastily) in joining the Church of Rome.'³ The result of his prayerful deliberation was that he returned to the old faith, and after just about two years passed as a Romanist—on October 1, 1843—Mr. Sibthorp received Holy Communion as a member of the Church of England.

Very little indeed is told us besides the simple fact. But it is clear that he had altogether misapprehended the relative positions and special advantages of the Churches. One of the most learned and intelligent of Anglican converts, after long experience of the Roman Church, and while still a member of it, wrote that the result of his experience had been to teach him that

'the notion of the Sacraments exercising any greater influence upon the heart and life in the Church of Rome than in the Church of England, admitting the dispositions of those who frequent them to be the same in both cases, is not merely preposterous, but as contrary both to faith and fact, as is the opinion that the Pope is Antichrist and the Man of Sin.'

Again:—

'What people say of those generally who have become Roman Catholics in England of late years, is that they have deteriorated as a body rather than advanced. The foremost of them have not progressed in any perceptible degree—perceptible that is by others—

¹ *Life*, p. 71.

² *Ibid.* p. 74.

³ *Ibid.* p. 75.

beyond the high standard which they had attained before. . . . Others, every allowance being made for the peculiar trials to which they had been subjected, have notoriously descended to a lower level of Christianity since they became Roman Catholics, from that in which they had been working previously; and some have been driven from their moorings—in appearance at least—altogether. . . . For a calm, unassuming uniform standard of practical Christianity, I have seen nothing as yet among ourselves in any country superior to that of the English parsonage and its surroundings.’¹

So too thought and wrote Mr. Sibthorp:—

‘I am myself thoroughly persuaded that no one ought to quit the Church of England for the Church of Rome, and that Newman and his friends have greatly erred in what they have just done. . . . There is a grievous corruption of practice and of doctrine as *practically held* in the Church of Rome, but there are most painful deficiencies in the Church of England, and many great practical evils.’²

The devout spirit which animated Mr. Sibthorp at this time is well expressed in the following extract; but what will strike most readers with amazement is that, about a month after having made this all-important secession, the possibility of his moving back again should have been present to his mind:—

‘I wish to assure you that I am aiming to be prostrate at God’s disposal, at the foot of the Cross, to do and suffer whatever be His holy will. I still praise, and, unless I come to see things very differently, shall praise the Catholic [Roman] Church for her daily devotions, &c. Yes, my mind on all these subjects is unaltered. But, *as yet*, I dare not retrace the step that I have taken; and I trust, as you justly and devoutly observe, that my reasons, if they remain, may be found just and weighty when we shall appear at the tribunal of God.’³

By degrees, however, Mr. Sibthorp settled down quietly into Anglicanism, and began to wish for work in the English Church. He was contented to spend three years of retirement, but after that he thought himself justified in seeking employment. The Bishop of Winchester, however, did not judge it prudent to authorize this without some special safeguards. He had heard, it seems, from some officious Romish priest that Mr. Sibthorp attended Romish services, and he thought it necessary to require a declaration from him that he had completely renounced Romish errors before granting him a licence. This very natural precaution Mr. Sibthorp very much resented. He thought it unfair and unkind, and refused to

¹ *The Church’s Creed, or the Crown’s Creed*, by E. S. Ffoulkes, B.D.

² *Life*, p. 80.

³ *Ibid.* p. 79.

accede to it. He then left Winchester for Lincoln, and about this time he seems first to have entertained the happy thought of building a set of almshouses in memory of his mother. This design he proceeded at once to carry out, and it furnished much pleasant and useful work for many years. The Bishop of Lincoln (Kaye) welcomed him to the diocese, and gave him employment in the Lincoln churches. The illustrious Pugin furnished him with plans for his almshouses, and all seemed smiling and promising for the future.

‘Throughout all the arrangements there was no stint; they left no room for grumbling. Everything was thought of, and, as far as possible, provided for; and all was carried out as to the Lord, and not to men. Bits of his own handiwork are to be found in the houses, and he laid out the grounds with the greatest taste, and at much expense. The painting of the chapel, when it was built in 1853, occupied much of his devout thought and loving individual attention.’¹

Mr. Sibthorp’s views as to his past aberrations and present position seem now to have been much cleared. He wrote to the Bishop of Lincoln:—

‘In the autumn of 1841 I quitted the communion of the Church of England for that of Rome. The step was a hasty and erroneous one, taken without due and prayerful consideration. The reasons which I soon after published I consider to have been altogether insufficient to justify the step, and I deeply regret their publication. I consider the Church of England a sound and healthy portion of Christ’s Holy Catholic Church.’²

Thus apparently established in the faith, and certainly full of good works and alms-deeds, Mr. Sibthorp spent seventeen years, if not with complete happiness to himself, yet with great profit to others. But there were ominous indications that all was not finally settled. His biographer marks his isolation and loneliness. He had no friends near him. Lincoln was then thoroughly dead in the matter of churchmanship. He was dissatisfied with the Anglican Liturgy. He was struck by the saintliness sometimes reached in the Roman Church. He regrets the non-use of unction of the sick. He writes (1849):—

‘I feel a very peculiar attachment to Birmingham, and an oppressive recollection of my days of interesting ministry there. I have not known a happy day since. Yet do not suppose my eyes are less open to the evils of that Church of which I am yet a priest. Indeed, it is by a strange peculiarity that I cannot shut my eyes to her beauties, or her defects.’³

¹ *Life*, p. 88.

² *Ibid.* p. 99.

³ *Ibid.* p. 108.

A strange peculiarity, indeed. The case is probably unique. He himself likens his condition to that of 'a piece of steel placed equidistant between two loadstones.' Meantime he watched with deep interest, and somewhat of amazement, the rapid progress made by Rome, and the gathering in of the rich harvest by her from the Tractarian party. He could not but feel sympathy with those who were treading the same path which he himself had trodden before.

'I cannot agree with you,' he writes, 'in your remark about Newman, Ward, Oakeley, and Dalgairns being worried out of the Church of England. None of these men were of a calibre to have been worried into such a step as joining the Roman Church. No. Strong views as to the Church, with extreme dissatisfaction with the discipline, or rather no-discipline, of the English Church, and yet more with her liturgical services, especially that of Holy Communion—these were the co-operating causes of their removal from the Anglican to the Roman branch.'¹

We cannot do these eminent men the injustice of thinking that Mr. Sibthorp was in any way right as to the reasons of their conversion. What! leave the Church of their baptism because they saw some defects in her! Much the same would it be for a son to relinquish and repudiate his parents because he observed some faults in their behaviour. A little later Mr. Sibthorp speaks of reading the *Apologia*, as finding it unsatisfactory and not understanding it: 'The attractions of the Roman Church were to him so different.' He thinks, however, that Dr. Newman almost annihilates Mr. Kingsley. Mr. Sibthorp's mind clearly did not harmonize with Dr. Newman's. He expresses regard for him, and says, somewhat strangely, that he is improving in gentleness and tenderness; and then adds, 'If he becomes a Roman Catholic he becomes a Christian! Dr. Newman never in any degree influenced me, nor would his reasoning in this *Apologia* at all influence me, but I greatly esteem and reverence him.'² Perhaps the subtle niceties of the *Apologia* may not have had a direct effect upon Mr. Sibthorp, but there is no doubt that Dr. Newman's secession, and that of the many other men of mark, learning, and piety, who left the Church of England at that disastrous time, destroyed that equilibrium which Mr. Sibthorp had been so long striving to maintain. He thought he was not influenced by others, perhaps. He was fond of saying so: 'Don't suppose that I am influenced by the arguments of Dr. Manning, or any one else.'³ But he was mistaken. The

¹ *Life*, p. 138.² *Ibid.* p. 141.³ *Ibid.* p. 147.

great Oxford movement carried him along with it: a piece of driftwood more easily detached than many, because its joints were not close. It was not argument; it was not an admiration of all that was in the Roman Church. It was sympathy, together with the awakened remembrance of the tremendous obligations he had taken upon himself at his second ordination, which carried this good but unstable man a third time to Rome. He left Lincoln in the summer of 1864, and went to London. For some time he seems to have practised the purest eclecticism. He attended S. Andrew's, Wells Street, the beautiful music at which church he always much admired, and then went to visit the Carmelite monks and the poor Clares. A curious instance of his eclectic tastes was the attempt to construct a Communion Office which should unite the virtues of the Roman Mass and the English Liturgy.¹ But the position of a Christian unattached could not satisfy Mr. Sibthorp long. He had come quite to the brink, but he hesitated for a moment to make the final plunge, dreading, naturally enough, the sneers and taunts which would be levelled at his instability and fickleness of purpose. January 5, 1865, he writes:—

'I am passing through a great conflict. You can understand the nature of it. The fact is, I fear to do wrong. Conflicting claims pull me first one way and then another; and sacred engagements, pretty clear perceptions of excesses and defects, some experience of the profit and losses on both sides—these and other things weigh heavily.'²

The plunge was at length made, and no doubt after it Mr. Sibthorp felt great relief. For the remainder of his life—a period of upwards of fourteen years—Mr. Sibthorp continued to officiate as a priest in the Romish Church. We shall have something to say presently of the way in which he held Roman doctrines, and his thoughts and feelings about Romish and Anglican matters, in his latter days. This we judge to be by far the most interesting part of the biography. But before we touch upon this we must say a word on this strange phenomenon of the great crop of conversions of which Mr. Sibthorp in his final change formed a part, and on the question generally of conversions from Anglicanism to Rome.

Why is the Anglican Church condemned to lose from time to time some of its children through a system which cannot certainly stand the test of reason or of historical inquiry,³

¹ See *Life*, p. 157.

² *Ibid.* p. 162.

³ 'It was to little purpose that anyone addressed to him arguments

however attractive it may be by its unbounded claims of power and its abundant provision of devotional exercises? The answer to this must be sought first of all in the historical position of the Church of England.

Alone among the Churches of the West she has had the wisdom and the courage to break herself free from the degrading bondage of Rome without impairing the continuity of her Church life and losing her succession and her sacraments. Hence the especial antipathy of Rome to her, and the constant attempts to undermine her by way of reprisals. But why are Anglicans more apt to yield to these efforts of Rome than Presbyterians or Nonconformists, than Lutherans or Calvinists? It is because their religion is intimately and fundamentally associated with the gifts and privileges of a Church; because their spiritual sustenance is drawn from Church sources, and they have learnt to prize above all things that which the Church has to offer. The Church of Rome *seems* to some of them to have much greater provision of such blessings than their own communion. It claims to be infallible, it guarantees salvation, it undertakes the complete regulation of the spiritual life, it offers a vast apparatus of services and endless variety of religious cults. It is this which attracts our Anglicans and has far greater charms for them than for others. They are not controversially convinced, they are enthusiastically led. They are brought in not by the head, but by the heart. A higher life, a more complete surrender, a more perfect self-devotion is what they dream of, and they fondly hope to find peace from all their troubles and freedom from all their doubts.

But would it be possible for motives so utterly inadequate and insufficient as these to lead good men to an act of self-seeking and self-pleasing which must needs require a very strong reason to justify it, were not some other cause lying beneath, perhaps unmarked and unappreciated, but certainly a most powerful factor in all Anglican movements in these latter days. That cause is the individualism and independence of action claimed and exercised by the Anglican clergy generally, and which, though it doubtless has its good side, has this mischief about it, that it renders the clergy liable to start

drawn from history or antiquity as to the claims of the rival Churches in England. There his mind was made up. He never had much taste for learned research, and he now simply *put aside this branch of the question!*—*Life*, p. 146. This is eminently characteristic and very like some of Dr. Manning's late utterances. Fancy *putting aside* as 'a branch of the question' matters of fact on which the whole edifice rested.

aside at any sudden impulse or fancied call of duty. This has already been noted as the characteristic of the Evangelical School, from the bosom of which Mr. Sibthorp's first secession proceeded. It was also no less the characteristic of the Tractarians, in company with and influenced by whom he went finally to Rome. It is curious to observe how in the beginning of the publication of the *Tracts* it was absolutely necessary that each man should fight for his own hand, and although one writer constantly contradicted another, and the absurdity was patent that publications coming from the same place and in a numbered series should have these contrarieties, yet the proposal made to subject them to a revising committee was scouted.¹ United action, united opinion, and the submission of the individual to the whole, are things scarcely as yet dreamed of in the English Church. What individual ever thinks of submitting to the whole?² If he is told by his bishop to do anything which he does not like, he writes to the *Guardian* and abuses his bishop, and gets the sympathy of his brethren, and perhaps a leading article in the *Church Times*. The extravagance of self-assertion which prevails is no doubt due to the awakening of life within the Church without adequate provision being made for regulating it. Individual action has anticipated corporate. The bishops have been feeble and timid, the Church synods slow and cramped with old incumbrances, the family life has helped to elevate the individual clerk into self-esteem and self-confidence; and so we present to Christendom the ridiculous spectacle of men running about from one Church to another, tasting this and rejecting that, and apologizing for the other, instead of accepting our Church position as a thing which must not, under any circumstances, be tampered with or called in question. Mr. Sibthorp was a notable example of this self-pleasing, a very pendulum in his vibrations; but it is only fair to bear in mind in his case, that though his Church membership, his ecclesiastical position, changed, yet the man himself never changed. He was not one of those somewhat contemptible

¹ See *Narrative of Events connected with Tracts for the Times*, by Rev. W. Palmer, p. 23.

² One of the venerable authors of the *Tracts* speaks some weighty words on this point. 'If the whole Church, including the Greek and Anglican communions, were to define these or any other points to be *de fide*, I should hold all further inquiry as to evidence to be at an end. In whatever way they should rule any question, however contrary to my previous impressions, I should submit to it. . . . I have ever submitted my credenda to a power beyond myself.'—Dr. Pusey, 'Is Healthful Reunion Impossible?' p. 4.

persons who having stepped across the boundary line between the Anglican and Roman communions straightway turn round and rail at what they have just left behind them, and strive to prove their devotion to their new creed by exaggerated laudations and songs of triumph. Not only did he altogether shrink from endeavouring to induce others to follow his example, but he had a strong repugnance to converts and all their ways. He never doubted for a moment that grace was to be had, and excellent spiritual results to be obtained in the Church of England. His mind was so fully occupied with the eternal verities, his heart so set on advancing in the knowledge and love of God, that outward forms were to him of comparatively trifling importance. He believed that he could get more spiritual good in the Church of Rome than in that of England, and he entered her communion. But he had not really changed. He was the same as of old. The heart was the same. The thoughts and expressions were the same. He corresponded with the same friends. He used the same books. He preached the same Gospel. And no one who knew him well, both in his Anglican and Roman conditions, could detect any difference between the Anglican and Roman Sibthorp.

How different all this from the history of most converts. Who that has been at all conversant with the religious world of England during the last thirty years can fail to remember many instances in which the change of creed has involved a complete change of life and character. The sarcastic smile, the scornful shrug, the bitter gibe, the scoffing at all argument, the self-satisfied assumption, the pretentious air of devotion, the affectation of strangeness to all past associations : these things mark and distinguish that most objectionable production of modern religionism, the Anglican convert. Often, alas, he or she is marked by even more pernicious signs ; by a rapid deterioration of moral character, by an abandonment of all high spiritual aims, by a complete surrender to worldly influences and habits.¹

There were none of these things in Richard Waldo Sibthorp, and thus the remarkable religious history here presented to us exhibits a portraiture probably quite unique. We see a man of the deepest spirituality, of the most abounding charity, living, as it were consciously, under the very eye of God, and with the needs of his fellow-creatures ever felt more deeply than his own, yet never able fully to satisfy himself with the outward

¹ See *The Church's Creed*, by Mr. Ffoulkes.

expression and form of the religion which he so dearly loved, passing from one form of faith to another in search of the perfect life, and finding in none the complete satisfaction for his aspirations. It is hardly right, therefore, to speak of the varying outward conditions of Mr. Sibthorp's religious life as *conversions*. The most real and essential part of him, the inner man, was not changed, but only exhibited under different figures. We proceed to illustrate this by showing what the views and opinions of this convert to Romanism were, and how he ever kept alive in all their freshness the graces of a tender, devout, and loving spirit. He writes:—

'My fixed principle has been, and I think would always be, "Though I may prefer the Roman Church for myself, I will leave others entirely unbiassed." I don't wish to tease or worry you, but it is just to myself to say that my own junction with the Roman Church was one not of conviction, of necessity in order to salvation, but of preference in order to spiritual profiting and the serving of God in peace. The distinction is great. I preferred (shall I say that I do prefer) the Roman Church in her worship, especially her Eucharistic sacrifice, her sacramental ordinances, her discipline, her many helps to a closer walk with God, her special aids to the ministry of the Word by confession, &c. &c.; but this preference (not a mere liking, but a sense of advantage) was, and is, in entire consistency with the unquestioning belief, the most genuine recognition—I hardly know words strong enough to express my judgment herein—of salvation out of her communion. How shall I doubt this, who have known the Scotts, Cecil, Milner, Daniel Wilson, Bickersteth, Haldane Stewart, and many others, not to speak of Wesley, and Fletcher of Madeley, whose personal friends were mine? Such men were, in their measure and day, "the salt of the earth." Therefore, I repeat again, I would not stir a step to move anyone who feared and served God out of the Church of England into the Church of Rome, unless he said, "I cannot conscientiously stay as I am." Then I would tell him my views or preferences. Neither, however, could I stir to bring any one from the Roman to the Anglican communion.'

With these views as to the merits of both Churches, it might be expected that Mr. Sibthorp would have gladly supported the Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom. On the contrary, he utterly rejected it—or rather the proposed scheme for bringing it about:—

'My own opinion is that it will, if acted on, prove a *tuba discordiæ* in the Church of England. For, to say no more, what will the whole Evangelical body, clerical and lay, and even the High and dry, say to such an expression as to "offer the Holy Sacrifice," and that, too, "with a special intention"? Why, the idea of all this is utterly

¹ *Life*, p. 152.

rejected by the former, and the opinion is general that the Holy Eucharist is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving—no more; and that it is a Popish superstition to maintain the contrary. The very notion of a holy sacrifice, in the sense of this circular, is repudiated, written and preached against, *utterly scouted*.¹

With regard to the Eucharistic sacrifice, he says, a little further on: 'I know some few of her bishops have held, and some of her clergy and laity do hold, this, but it is not her true doctrine.' Evidently Mr. Sibthorp had forgotten, if he had ever read, the treatment of this subject in the *Tracts for the Times*, and the proof there given that all the great divines of the Church of England had held the Eucharistic sacrifice.² It is not improbable that his views might have been greatly enlightened and cleared, and perhaps his final secession to Rome prevented, had he met with, before it took place, such a book as Dr. Pusey's *On the Truth and Office of the English Church*. He does not, however, ever seem to have had any taste for the Oxford theology. The change which Mr. Sibthorp went through from being an Evangelical of the purest type to be a Romish priest is curiously illustrated by a fact mentioned by him. He went to see his nephew, Mr. Yard, who was in 'retreat' in preparation for the Romish ministry, and he found him established at Clapham, in the very house formerly occupied by the Thorntons, and

'where used to meet Macaulay, old Mr. Grant, Mr. Wilberforce, and the leading Evangelicals, lay and clerical, of fifty or sixty years ago; the identical house where the Bible Society was set on foot, by men all great in their goodness, and some good in their greatness; the house celebrated in a remarkable article in the *Edinburgh*, some twenty years since, entitled "The Clapham Sect." Now it is occupied by another kind of saints, the Redemptorist Fathers—men, I believe, really not less holy, and certainly more self-denied as to matters of daily life.'³

It was Mr. Sibthorp's misfortune throughout to act far too much from impulse and feeling, and not enough from calm and sober consideration. His final secession to Rome was in reality no more a deliberate and well-weighed step

¹ *Life*, p. 153.

² 'In the Holy Eucharist we do in act what in our prayers we do in words. I am persuaded that on this point the two Churches might be reconciled by explanations of the terms used. The Council of Trent claims nothing for the Holy Eucharist but an *application* of the one meritorious Sacrifice of the Cross. An application of that sacrifice the Church of England believes also.'—*Truth and Office*, &c., p. 28. (This book was not published till about a year after Mr. Sibthorp's secession.)

³ *Life*, p. 159.

than his first and second ones had been. He had neither rightly gauged the immense progress that the English Church was making, nor had he rightly perceived that Rome was the same as ever, and that what he found intolerable in 1843 would be equally oppressive to him in 1865. He was welcomed back very kindly by the Romish authorities, and at once reinstated in his priestly functions in which he found much pleasure. The Pope 'sent him a blessing *with his whole heart*.'¹ He was soon established in regular work at Nottingham, where he spent the remainder of his long life. His teaching was studiously moderate. 'I don't think this has led me to any ultra statements, or to imitate some converts, who seem to think to make up for former anti-Catholicity by excessive language and violence, especially about the Blessed Virgin and the Pope.'² He looks on with amused wonderment at the rapid development of Ritualism in the English Church:—

'Copes and chasubles seem to be getting all at once into high favour. Nurse Gamp would have gloried in this fashion, and have enlarged her umbrella to protect the folds of her investiture. At York, the exhibition of church decorative dress created quite a sensation, and helped to send divers Protestant clergy to attend High Mass at our chapel; to see I suppose how they looked on living shoulders, and not on wooden frames.'³

Mr. Sibthorp's old high Toryism was occasionally curiously brought into collision with his Catholic sympathies. He writes:—

'We have had a great deal of election bustle and uproar here; but all ended here with remarkable quietness, and in the return of one thorough Conservative, and a second Conservative on the Irish Disestablishment question. On the Irish Church question I take a different view from my colleagues here, and voted accordingly. I consider it a breach of faith as regards the Union; anything but likely to benefit the Irish themselves—withdrawing from them the Protestant landlords and the wealthier Protestant clergy; likely to make Ireland an arena of greater struggle between Catholics and Protestants than it has been.'⁴ 'I am one of the *rari nantes* in our Church who don't go along with Messrs. Bright and Gladstone.'

And not only did not Mr. Sibthorp altogether agree with his Romish friends in their politics; he also soon begins to show himself startled by their religious views. He complains that Catholics don't read the Bible at all, comparatively.⁵ He was startled by the strong expressions in Dr. Newman's

¹ *Life*, p. 171.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 200.

² *Ibid.* p. 183.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 204.

³ *Ibid.* p. 187.

letter to Dr. Ullathorne. He writes: 'Young men take in ecclesiastical matters and theological questions, as in political ones, extreme and ultra views; even the great Bossuet is now talked against and found much fault with as a Gallican, though what that means I hardly know!' ¹ Faber he thinks had bad taste. The *Month* was improving, but the *Tablet* he could not stand, and had given it up. *Loss and Gain* does not much interest him, 'howbeit Newman is the author.' 'I do not go along with our people generally,' he writes, 'as regards events in Italy. Apart from the Pope's responsibility as trustee for the estates of the Church, I think his position is rather better than before.' ² Again:—

'I don't like Newman's last letter about the Infallibility. I think it shows a want of temper and also of memory.' ³ 'You speak of the *Tablet*. I never look into it. Mr. Yard called it a detestable paper. So do I. So Ultramontane. So out-Heroding Herod. The Pope is not imprisoned nor ill-treated in any way; and in my opinion far better without than with the burden of the temporal power.' ⁴ 'I fear dear — will set me down as a very latitudinarian or liberal Catholic. I cannot deny my convictions grounded on knowledge and observation of history, men, and facts.' ⁵

Mr. Sibthorp's open and honest character did, in fact, not only lead him to disapprove of much that was going on around him, but also to draw upon himself some amount of censure from the authorities. He could not see tamely and contentedly the Ultramontane Romanist allying himself in an unholy union with the Infidel and the Republican, in order that by this alliance an injury might be inflicted on the Church of England. The tactics of the Liberation Society did not commend themselves to him, and what he disapproved he did not hesitate to censure:—

'Infidelity, Republicanism, and Unitarianism are bidding for support; which I hope I need not say none of them will get from me; though two attacks on the former which I have made from the public press and the pulpit have brought on me in some quarters somewhat of a snubbing, with great personal courtesy to myself, but disapprobation of my loyalty and orthodoxy, as excessive and calculated to keep down free and public discussion—in other words, to check the spread of the spirit of the age.' ⁶ 'I never was one of those who having left the Church of England thought it right to deny her—nor can I. I admire her for the mass of truth that is in her, while I sensibly feel her disqualifications.' ⁷

¹ *Life*, p. 206.

² *Ibid.* p. 213.

³ *Ibid.* p. 237.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 241.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 245.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 261.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 267.

Mr. Sibthorp was of opinion that Mr. Gladstone had by far the best of it in his famous pamphlet-war, and that almost all the replies to him were 'evasive.' He did not think much dependence was to be placed on 'Catholic loyalty,' inasmuch as 'the test of it had not yet come.'¹ The Ultramontanes were an offence to him in their opinions, and equally so in their new fashions of vestments:—

'If poor Pugin could see now the sad changes in the externals of architecture, vestments and service, &c., which the Roman Curia makes, he would lose his mind again. All vestments are to be Roman; which reminds one of those things which the men who go about London to sell Warren's blacking wear: a sort of chasuble before and behind! The Oratory in London is giving tone to ceremonial and decorations. All is to be Roman, modern Roman, not Anglo-Catholic, as Pugin would have had it. Tasteless Ultramontanism is at the bottom of it all.'² 'I believe you are right about Pugin's disappointment and the effect on him, who had longed and laboured to see the Catholic Church, as to services, vestments, discipline, &c., as England knew her all through the Saxon, Norman, and Plantagenet days. . . . It is now Ultramontane and Roman versus old and national.'³

There is much of sadness now in many of his utterances as to his position and surroundings:—

'My own position at Nottingham is rather (or, very much, I might say) an isolated one.' 'I want to lead our Catholic people into some knowledge of and reflection on Scripture truth, and not to be content with saying over the Rosary, and being present at Mass and Benediction. I remember Mr. Yard saying to me in a tone of sorrow and vexation—"It is no use to speak to our people about Jeremiah's birthplace; they don't know there was such a person as Jeremiah." And I must say it was true; of course, there are now great exceptions. The converts to our Church have been better taught.'⁴

More and more was Mr. Sibthorp convinced of the vast importance of preserving intact the English Church as the established religion of the land:—

'I regard the Church of England,' he writes, 'as such a support to the British Crown and present Constitution, that if she is pulled down they will follow.' 'I believe the existence of the monarchy,

¹ *Life*, p. 281.

² *Ibid.* p. 282. In another place he writes, 'All the surplices have been cut up into cottas—frightful things like bibs, not reaching even to the hips. I hold on to my little surplice, which therefore has escaped the massacre. It is one of the All Saints, Margaret Street, pattern'—(p. 294).

³ *Ibid.* p. 284.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 289.

Constitution, and welfare of England is dependent on the continued Church Establishment. I care not who hears me say so.'¹

In support of this opinion, which was to him a deeply cherished one, Mr. Sibthorp did not hesitate to appear at public meetings, and to make use of his great and touching eloquence in support of the Established Church. The effect of this was so great, especially as coming from one in his position, that he was able virtually to defeat the Liberatorists at their own meeting.² As regards 'things near,' he writes:—

'I feel most concerned about what you and others, perhaps, may suppose would not trouble me—the efforts making to disestablish the Church of England.'³ 'Will Newman accept the honorary fellowship? I cannot say that I quite approve the matter. I don't like the universities of our land to be separated from the Church of England.'⁴ 'Can it be right or judicious, to say the least, for the President and Fellows of Trinity to receive such an adversary of the Established Church as a fellow? I love the Church of England with all her faults and defects.'⁵

Again, when he was drawing very near to the end, he writes to his old and long-tried friend, Dr. Bloxam:—

'I wish to express to you my entire and decided disapproval of Dr. Newman's last step, "the Cardinal's hat." Oh! it is a very sad step. I don't mince the matter. You may let him know it. Whatever you do, "do not be tempted to leave your present position," is the closing advice of your old friend. I see how the wind blows, but do not blow with it. Grace be with you.'⁶

His biographer remarks upon this passage:—

'These are the strongest words which Mr. Sibthorp ever used on this subject. And they show most touchingly that the disillusion was—shall we not say it?—complete. That which he had sought and fancied he had found in Rome fails him at last. For, in truth, the Rome which he had loved, and so persistently sought after, was really no more. Even post-Tridentine Rome had passed away, and given place to the Rome of the Vatican dogma. And now Vaticanism hangs like a dark cloud over his dying hours, and as regards churches and systems he feels every prop and stay falling away from him.'⁷

Towards the last he had to endure great bodily anguish together with terrible depression of mind. Holy Scripture and the English Prayer Book were the books to which at the

¹ *Life*, p. 298.

² *Ibid.* p. 338.

³ *Ibid.* p. 362.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 301.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 342.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 322.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 362.

last he looked for comfort, and in his will he left directions that he should be buried in an Anglican cemetery with the Burial Service of the Church of England.

Enough, and perhaps more than enough, has been said to illustrate Mr. Sibthorp's ecclesiastical position and history. It would be utterly unfair and misleading if the reader were left under the impression that this is the most important side of his life, or that it forms the most characteristic part of Mr. Fowler's biography of him. Throughout all his changes of ecclesiastical position, Mr. Sibthorp preserved the essential unity of the devout life, and faith and trust in the Saviour; and the single eye to His honour and glory was equally conspicuous in him whether Anglican or Roman. His growth in religion is evident from his youth upwards, and we are quite at a loss to understand why his biographer, after having told us that he was 'always of a devout tone and temper,'¹ seeks about for and tries to settle chronologically what he calls his 'conversion.' This is to give unnecessary support to that mischievous dream of the Wesleyans that each Christian must have a definite and fixed time of conversion, which may be ascertained and dated. No sooner was Mr. Sibthorp ordained than the power and persuasiveness that belonged to him manifested themselves. His earlier ministry is thus described :—

'There was at this period a force, vividness and scriptural truth about Mr. Sibthorp's ministrations which won for them acceptance even with the fastidious, and worldly and indifferent. His preparations for the pulpit were the evident fruits of severe and well-directed study. His sermon was never written.² It was delivered from notes. But it was no crude, hasty, and immature effort. Slight, indeed, was the portion of dross mingled with the ore. The gem was elaborately set. It came rounded, sparkling and polished from the crucible of study, reflection and prayer.'³

He was devoted to pastoral ministrations, and admirably skilled in this by far the hardest part of clerical duty. At Ryde, the attachment of his flock to him was enthusiastic. One of them writes of his preaching :—'He took me almost into the presence of God, and this feeling did not leave me for a length of time.'⁴ 'He could preach for an hour with intense animation, and the sermon was yet short in the estimate of his hearers.'⁵ His Christian counsels to those who were in trouble were admirable. He writes to one :—

¹ *Life*, p. 20.

² His biographer states in a note that this is not true of all his sermons.

³ *Life*, p. 33.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 51.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 53.

'You are now called to be perfected through sickness, and I believe God is accomplishing his will concerning you, which is your sanctification, by causing you more than ever to experience what a reed a Christian is in himself and in his present condition. . . . Again and again I have seen reasons to admire the goodness of God in dealings which at the time tried me most severely; and if in this dark state such satisfaction can be derived from a glimpse, how much more we may be sure it will be in the world of light and of full revelation of the righteous ways of God.'¹

His changes seemed only to deepen the earnestness of his spiritual life. After that of 1841, he writes—'I must earnestly pray for that grace, without which I cannot do a single good act, nor will a righteous disposition, to work in me the mind of Christ, to conform me to His Image, and to make me wholly and for ever dedicated to His service.'² Soon after he sends as a message to an old servant his 'earnest hope that she is trying to keep on the brink of heaven, ready to step in at a moment's notice.'³ 'To me,' he writes, 'to live is Christ. There can be nothing to compare with this! This poor and empty world! Oh! how to be pitied are they who think they see in it what is satisfactory. If God be ours, what do we want?'

The following was written about a fortnight after his return to the Anglican Church:—

'This year is now getting on pretty far into its last quarter, and will soon be among the years that are past. But ah! what progress has it seen in each of us towards the kingdom of heaven, where years will be unknown? what advancement in conformity to the image of Jesus? what growth in grace? what work done for God? This is the main thing: being the end for which time is given and continued to us.'⁴

A few years later he writes:—

'How touching is that exhortation in the 122nd Psalm, verses 6 and following. I do bless God that I can truly say that my soul feels united with such an one as De Rentz in the Church of Rome and John Wesley in his own Church; but with the *Tablet* kind of men I have no union nor sympathy. They seem to me not to know what manner of spirit they are of.'⁵

The following is a very sad utterance:—

'What a comfort it is to have God to go to, and to be permitted to carry to Him our wants and cares! But for this I should quite sink; for, independent of personal trials and temptations, my past life has given me such insight into the two great antagonist Churches

¹ *Life*, p. 60.

² *Ibid.* p. 69.

³ *Ibid.* p. 73.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 78.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 110.

of this day—those of Rome and England—that I know not how to find rest for my foot in either. I cannot follow — and his confères into their Mariolatry and bigotry; nor can I find satisfaction in the freezing High Churchmanship of Dr. — and others of his class; while the major part of the Evangelicals appear full of bigotry in their way, and idolatrous of their own right of judgment and action.’¹

Mr. Sibthorp’s work as chaplain in the newly-consecrated chapel of his Bede-houses is well sketched by his biographer.

‘No one who ever attended a service there conducted by Richard Sibthorp could easily forget it. His whole look, attitude, manner, were as eloquent as his solemn and searching addresses; and all were, so to speak, in devout harmony with the thought that here were some aged Christian souls being led to God and His worship by their aged and much tried friend and benefactor. His marvellous reverence showed a man surrounded, indeed, by others, yet alone with God. It was not merely recollectedness, it was *absorption*. He breathed an atmosphere of prayer, which attracted into it the colder devotional feelings of his fellow-worshippers.’²

Thus he was as an Anglican. The following must suffice to indicate his temper and feelings when he was returning to Rome:—

‘I would know and do God’s will in my own rather peculiar case, and I pray God that my own may be put to death in the matter. It is a great matter to live the hour to God as we shall wish to have lived it when we come before the Judge of all.’³

We cannot trace any change in the feelings and language of Mr. Sibthorp after his final return to Rome, and we are assured there was no essential change in his teaching. In the pulpit at Nottingham he still preached Christ crucified as he had done at Lincoln. He shrank with horror from anything like Mariolatry. He writes to a remonstrant clergyman:—

‘You speak as if I did not hold any longer to the “one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus.” I assure you that I know but of one Mediator of atoning righteousness, even that same Jesus Christ.’⁴

Again:—

‘I want to live in and on Christ, and to bring others to seek the same (as it was with Lacordaire)—the love of our Lord Jesus Christ, apart from which there is neither victory nor happiness.’⁵

Quotations might be multiplied, but these will suffice to show that Mr. Sibthorp always maintained a special and singular devotion to our Blessed Lord. Indeed, the distinctive

¹ *Life*, p. 111.

² *Ibid.* p. 123.

³ *Ibid.* p. 157.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 185.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 205.

peculiarities of the Romish devotional system, which have grown to such portentous dimensions in modern days, are scarce alluded to in any of his letters. No one would have been more shocked at the notion that the Blessed Virgin was 'co-redemptress with Jesus,' that 'she merited by congruity the salvation of the whole world,' that 'she acted as mediatrix with the Mediator,' that 'the salvation of the world was granted by the Eternal Father, not only to Christ, but also to the Virgin,' that 'Christ obtained nothing by His merits which the Virgin Mother of God did not also gain out of congruity,' that 'Mary so loved the world that she gave her only-begotten Son.'¹ These blasphemies, we are sure, would have revolted Mr. Sibthorp, as they did, indeed, Cardinal Newman, when brought to his attention. But Mr. Sibthorp either was unaware of what divines of his Church had ventured to write, or he deliberately shut his eyes to it, and adopted an eclectic standpoint. Indeed, he appears to have read Romish devotional works but little. *S. Francis de Sales* (whose saintship has lately suffered such an unfortunate abatement) and the *Life of the Curé d'Ars* were favourite books with him, but they do not attract as much or as frequent commendation as the works of the Rev. Baldwin Brown and the Rev. Samuel Cox. Keble's *Christian Year* was ever his companion, and the works of Dr. Goulburn and Dr. Pusey are mentioned with praise. But the most thorough proof of the unity of Mr. Sibthorp's life, and of the continuity of his devout grasp of the great saving truths of the Gospel throughout, is furnished by his last work, on which, indeed, he was occupied up to the very time of his death—*The Daily Bread*. This book is intended to provide a little sermonette for every day of the year, together with some verses of hymns. Of these discourses, Mr. Sibthorp was able to finish 358 out of the 365. The Introduction to the book rightly characterizes the matter of it:—

'If one is sick of useless controversy, and strifes that are unprofitable and vain, he will find the author himself to be such an one, who will tell them that all is vanity, save God, and Christ, and life in Him.'

The sermons are such as might be preached by a devout Anglican; the hymns are taken from Anglican sources, and no clearer proof of the entirely un-Roman character of the book could be given than that which is furnished by a reviewer in the *Tablet*, who says: 'The book is written in what is

¹ See *The Truth and Office of the English Church*, pp. 150 sqq.

almost a foreign language—certainly an unfamiliar dialect to the Catholic reader.¹

We now take leave of this singular, but devout, and in many respects admirable man. In doing so we must not forbear a word of praise for the way in which his biography has been put together by Mr. Fowler. Intimately acquainted as he was with Mr. Sibthorp for many years, he has been able to give many touches and explanations which another could not have furnished, and he has done his work in an excellent spirit and with much taste. There are faults in the book no doubt, but these are partly inseparable from the character of the materials. The paucity of these has made it somewhat jejune in some of the most interesting parts, but their abundance in the latter years should not have tempted the compiler to heap up so many letters in the same strain. Mr. Fowler's own remarks and criticisms are always judicious and well expressed.

The memory of Richard Waldo Sibthorp is not likely to perish so long as the beautiful building on the hill of Lincoln, erected by him in memory of his mother, and dedicated to S. Anne, remains to show the taste and skill of the great architect Pugin and the munificence of the founder, who gladly adopted his beautiful designs. From first to last Mr. Sibthorp must have spent on S. Anne's Bedehouses during his lifetime some 50,000*l.* His other charitable donations were manifold and on the most liberal scale, and when he died his principal wealth consisted in a collection of old china, of which he had been a skilful collector for many years, and which he directed in his will should be sold and the proceeds be divided between S. Anne's and Earlswood. He 'rests from his labours and his works do follow him.'

ART. VII.—BRIGHT'S ANTI-PELAGIAN TREATISES
OF S. AUGUSTINE.

Anti-Pelagian Treatises of S. Augustine. Edited by W.
BRIGHT, D.D. (Oxford, 1880.)

THE Board by whom the studies of the Theological School at Oxford are controlled and directed have lately decided

¹ *Tablet*, October 4, 1879.

on a change of no small importance. They propose to break up the huge and unmanageable mass of dogmatic theology into three separate subjects, between which the student may take his choice, and, in his reading, they direct his attention to the subject so chosen, rather than to any particular book which they may require him to read. The examination will aim at testing his grasp on the principles with which the suggested books are concerned. The student will thus work with a definite aim before him; he will have a thread to follow, as he makes his way along; even if he loses something by narrowing his attention to one especial field, he will gain infinitely more than he loses by securing intelligent possession of the matters which he handles, instead of being left, at the end of his course, with a vague and insecure hold on a system of doctrine which deadens by its mass and bewilders by its variety. An accurate grasp on any one of the main theological subjects is a sure method of entry upon all the other subjects with which it is so intimately united.

One such subject, so proposed by the Board, is that of the Doctrine of Grace, with its bearings on the questions of nature and free-will; and the literature suggested for study under this head is naturally taken largely from the works of S. Augustine. It is in order to enable the student easily and conveniently to cover the prescribed ground that Dr. Bright, to whom the Theological School already owes so much, has brought together into a single volume the Augustinian Treatises which the Board advise for study, and within which the subject receives its chief discussion. The book is intended, primarily, for Oxford use, and it will win from Oxford, first of all, the grateful acknowledgment of the care and skill with which Dr. Bright brings to the use of the student his great learning and his dramatic freshness; but many, outside the immediate needs of Oxford, who are anxious to travel through the discussion by which questions of such momentous issue and deep-seated interest were first sifted and settled, will most thankfully welcome a book which enables them to follow the line of the great argument so thoroughly and so clearly.

Especially will they thank Dr. Bright for the Introduction with which he prefaces the *Treatises*, and in which he traces the whole course of the intellectual conflict from the first movement of Pelagius in 405 down to the famous and decisive Council of Orange in 529. Dr. Bright is here at his very best. His historical knowledge, always vivid and minute, gains force and unity and solidity from his mas-

terly perception of the theological issues at stake. Dr. Bright's handling of dogma is singularly firm and delicate; he has a clear eye for its living and spiritual force; he can allow it all its strength, without diminishing its freshness or its mobility. Few will read his excellent exhibition of the struggle without winning a new sense of the depth and reality of the vast interests involved in that critical hour of the Church's dogmatic movement, and a new and wondering appreciation of the skilful success with which she then controlled and mastered the conflicting forces, which, at a later date, she allowed to break out into such disastrous and fatal opposition. Nor will their gratitude end here, for Dr. Bright has bravely attempted to distinguish the voice of Catholic judgment from the voice of that noble and eloquent champion, to whom the victory of the deeper over the narrower truth is so largely due. The Church, which has cherished the name of the great Augustine with an admiration and an affection given to but few even of her greatest children, is yet free from all bondage to the letter of his writings. She is not his, but he is hers. The Spirit that is in her, that abides in her large heart, is no creature of the day. It arrives at each successive crisis, knowing the past as well as the present: it will outlive the troubles with which each generation, in turn, puts its nerve to proof; it is not carried off its balance; it retains its coolness, its self-possession, its secure control; it estimates without exaggeration; it decides without excitement or distortion; it can never fall into the partiality of fanaticism. Within the great unity of the gathered Church, all the thrilling questions of each passing hour find their level, their proportion, their subdual, their due discipline. It is this calm and sound judgment, so priceless, so assuring, which is so terribly maimed and weakened by the ruinous divisions of Christendom. But, in the days of S. Augustine, that large judgment, in spite of peril and doubt, could still find room and force to act; and Dr. Bright has most skilfully instanced the lines of division at which it parted from the extreme and unbalanced logic to which the fervour of Augustine gradually lent itself. It is possible—

‘to believe in the reality of internal grace, as *enabling* the soul, which responds to its touch, and which does so respond by its assistance, to achieve what would otherwise have been beyond its capacity, without admitting that this touch *determines* the response which it solicits and makes possible.’ Again, ‘we may believe that the sin of the first man entailed on his posterity a condition of sinfulness, . . . which involved a disorder and taint of the whole inner nature. . . .’

while yet we may avoid language which would suggest a literal imputation of Adam's sin to each of his descendants, admit that sin can bear only a modified sense in regard to what is not personal, acknowledge a certain operation of grace in the production of goodness among the unregenerated, and decline to adopt a rigorous application of the doctrine of inherited condemnation to all who die unbaptized.'

We cannot but think that all who read these careful and frank words will welcome them with a sense of glad relief. They clear off a whole network of dark and intricate troubles which have clung about the strong truths which underlie the Augustinian argument. Such intellectual difficulties as they leave unsolved are difficulties large as history, deep as human nature, real as life itself: they are not difficulties which cramp our vision and paralyse our heart; they are those for the solution of which we can await, without anxious unrest, the hour when we shall know even as we are known.

For there is this essential difference between the Pelagian and the Augustinian positions: that the former is clear and intelligible in its logic, but obscure, and undecided, and shiftily in its handling of those great facts of the moral and spiritual world, which the latter interprets with triumphant and harmonious mastery, even though its logic be driven at the last into the mystery of paradox. Yes, its logic may suffer itself to become paradoxical; for is not life itself a paradox? Is not man himself a being hung between two worlds, subject to the logic of heaven and to the logic of earth, at once a thing of eternity and a thing of time? What but paradox can adequately express a creature whose existence becomes intelligible in an Incarnation, in the God-man, in the Word that took flesh?

The Pelagian is at his best when dealing with the man *κατ' ὄψιν*, the man as you see him at first sight, the man as common-sense estimates him; this is what makes his position so plausible. Man is, for him, an individual, pure and simple: his virtues and his failings are his own affair: he has relations and connections with God, with his fellows, but he is, at the base, himself and no other, clear-cut, separate, isolated, bounded, alone. His will is his own; he moves it as he chooses; if not, surely, he is fated, he is irresponsible: how can he be condemned for that which he could not help doing? He cannot sin except in cases where he knew, and could do, the right, and yet refused. He can only be guilty of a fall there where he could have stood. This looks plain and simple enough; let us try on a little further.

There is nothing sinful in man, then, except that which he freely wills : his nature, then, his impulses, his affection, all these must be good and pure ; for God is good, and does not create man evil, and man does not fall until he wills sin. Man, then, is born *now* as pure as he was in Eden, capable of perfection. Children are begotten free from taint. Did not God Himself institute marriage ? the natural passions cannot be evilly inclined of themselves. Men, then, could be absolutely innocent before Christ came ; this would be true, even though few, or none, succeeded. God required innocence by the law, and He cannot have demanded the impossible.

The position is becoming strained and anxious ; let us try on yet a little deeper.

Men could be innocent before Christ came : they possessed the conditions of sinlessness, even though over-weighted by temptations and allured by bad examples. They yet had the entry into the kingdom of heaven ; the door was not shut ; and the virtues of the Jews, the devoted faith of the Patriarchs, the passionate adoration of the Psalmists, are the fruit and proof. These men are praised of God, acceptable to God. Not without God, indeed, could they have achieved this. This the Pelagian will gladly allow : man in his unaided strength could not have entered heaven ; but God had aided him always and in all places. He had given him originally the very powers by which to act innocently : these were of God, not of man's own. And to the Jew He had added the immense support of the law ; He had made known to man His ways ; He had promised him the assured reward ; He had backed him by all the aids that His pastoral care had devised. To do more than this would be to destroy the conditions of goodness ; it would force the freedom of choice ; it would stultify the very perfection which it wrought. Christ came to raise these aids, these inducements, to their highest power, to remove hindrances, to break down barriers that ancient sins had heaped together, to reveal the perfect way of holiness. Invited by the strong attraction of His love, men put forth their inborn capacities for good ; guided by His entire knowledge, they put forth these capacities without fear and without error. Here is the gain. Surely, to go further than this is to be Manichæan. And here the Pelagian advances from defence to attack. The Augustinian, he asserts, denies the reality of man's free-will, which, according to him, has been lost by the sin of Adam. He calumniates marriage, denying that it is ordained of God. He denies to

the saints of the older dispensation any freedom from the tyranny of sin ; he even refuses to the Apostles of Christ any genuine purity and holiness. Man, according to him, is no good creation of God, but is a creature born in lust, whose very nature has in it a taint of corruption. Nor does baptismal grace succeed in liberating him : by it sin is but shorn, the roots remain imbedded in the evil flesh, and from them springs again the full growth of sin.

Here is the case for Pelagius, a case starting from most obvious and plausible premisses ; and nothing, it seems to us, exhibits more decisively the mystical profundity that belongs to the most ordinary and universal emotions of daily human life than the discovery, under the pressure of the Pelagian controversy, how flat and poor and inadequate is the attempt of plain common-sense to give any intelligible significance to the religious experiences of mankind. The Pelagian logic finds itself in helpless collision with all that most deeply and strongly stirs the human spirit. It could make nothing of all that mighty language with which S. Paul read out the miserable impotence of man, the tyrannous bondage of iniquity. It could make nothing of words that spoke of slavery, of imprisonment, of a horrible body of clinging corruption ; nor, again, could it enter into that overpowering joy with which S. Paul knew himself to be caught up by the compelling force of a grace that violently forced him from himself and dragged him a willing captive, enslaved to righteousness, behind the chariot-wheels of Christ.

The great words of redemption, of renewal, of the new creature, the cry of the Psalmist against the sin in which his mother conceived him, the imploring cry to another, to God, for the renewal of a clean heart and of a right spirit, the unsounded depth of utterances which spoke of a sonship that could never be born out of the blood or of the will of man, of a freedom made for us by the Son, of that drawing of the Father without which none could come to Christ, of that gift of God by which alone we can become sheep of the Son's own fold : all this sleeps in the Pelagian's ear ; he has no logic wherewith to meet and understand it ; he stares at it, and wonders, and passes by ; to him it is exaggeration, it is misleading jargon ; his narrow common-sense is helplessly staggered by these tremendous paradoxes. And yet the very poorest, the most ignorant, of men understand and welcome every syllable of this astounding language. These strange words it is that have run like a flame through the dark and foul houses of woe and crime, and have moved the

passionate heart of the masses, and have built up from the hopeless and the lost the wonderful Church of Christ. The rich and the cultured have been again and again attracted by the easy clearness of Pelagianism : it has never deceived the suffering or the poor. To them, to the sinner, to the dying, those voices of S. Paul and of S. John, dark and mysterious as they may sound, strike home, strong in the force of a truth that is understood and grasped and held fast and known in full and clear security. It is no speculative puzzle that these paradoxes of Augustine express : they embody the spirit of all redemption, of all prayer, of all adoration ; it is the very life-blood of the Incarnation that is at stake.

There are three main positions which may be singled out of the mass of Augustinian argumentation in order to make clear to ourselves the spiritual domain into which the Pelagian logic never enters.

First, the Holiness of God Himself. What could the Pelagian make of that ? Was His Holiness the issue of His free choice between good and evil ? Must it have been possible for God to sin in order that His Goodness should be real ? Was there no necessity in this Holiness of His ? and yet, if necessitated, was it therefore no true Holiness ?

Such a remembrance of the eternal and absolute nature of God, of binding necessity yet of perfect goodness, carries us to our second main position, the conception of a freedom which shall be, not the thin and abstract and empty openness of choice imagined by the Pelagian, but the full and concrete expression, unhampered and undeadened, of the entire being. Choice is determined by love. In order to be free to choose what we ought, we must be able to love what we ought. A voluntary action is an action we love to do. To will the good, we must love the good. The Fall lost us our love for the good : we can love it no longer with all our souls, and hence we have lost the power of willing it. We are not free any longer to choose the good, but do we, for that, sin under compulsion ? No, we sin by loving the evil ; we will the evil because we love doing it. We freely choose sin. The condemnation is, not because we are dragged along by sin unwillingly, but because we, with all our being, delight in wrong.

Given that delight, sin is certainly inevitable, necessary : but the necessity does not diminish or negative the sin ; for it is that inevitability that itself constitutes the sinfulness. This is sin, that man so loves it that he cannot help sinning. This is sin, that a man so loves darkness that he cannot ever abandon it.

And now we pass easily to Augustine's third main position. Man, to be freed from sin, must be freed from his love for it: and his love is the issue of himself; it is he himself who is corrupt, dead to life, prone to death, inclined to the things of darkness. To be saved from sin, then, he must be saved from himself. His love must be changed; he must gain the renewal of his power of loving, and so choosing, God.

To restore him his freedom of will God must remake his desires, his affections, his impulses, his spiritual appetite. This is Grace, the gift of God, by which a new heart is created with a new power of love. The restoration of free will unto Holiness means, then, the infusion from above of the Holy Ghost into the soul of man, by which he is delivered from himself, changed, refashioned, made regenerate, a child of God, an heir of the Kingdom, being a member of Christ and of His Church.

From these three arguments it is easy to pass down to most of the minor problems dealt with in this controversy. The will of man will no longer be treated as an isolated and independent individuality; it now will seek to find its freedom, not in separation from, but in union with, the supreme will of God. Man's will works at its freest when embraced and enclosed within the life of the higher and omnipotent love. It will win its true freedom from the prevenient and stimulating energy of a will that inbreathes into it its own activity and its own desires.

Or again, Augustine will easily meet the persistent inquiry, Does God demand of man the impossible, since man has not the power to fulfil the demands of holiness? He demands, indeed, what is impossible to *man*, but possible enough to the divine energy which is always at hand to raise man to the level which of himself he cannot reach. Man cannot fulfil the law, just because man of himself can do nothing at all.

Did, then, the saints of the Old Testament accomplish nothing? Nay, they did much; but what they did was never their own doing: it was Christ in them, the power of the coming Redemption. The Lamb has been slain for them already from the foundation of the world. Pelagius denies to Christ His eternal efficacy.

So, too, the inheritance of sin becomes intelligible. For, though free choice of evil must be confined to each soul separately, yet disorder of the affections, weakness of will, tendencies of inclination, are all capable of transmission; and these have the nature of sin, if by sinfulness is meant the tendency to love the wrong. And, again, concupiscence

retains its evil taint even when it is driven out of the spirit into the region of blind and fleshly habit ; for though the will, fortified of God, refuses and is free, yet the very existence of wrong desire has in it the conditions of sin, it expresses a taint which we cannot wholly repudiate ; blind and instinctive as may be its working, its very wrongness is itself offensive to God and humiliating to man. Thus, apostles themselves may be found still battling with a corruption from which they have yet to be delivered.

In all this Augustine is firm and real and large, manifold as human life.

If behind it all there yet looms the awful burden of that last question, Why, if God be the sole stimulant of the human will, is not that stimulus altogether and universally sufficient ? —then all we can say is that the mystery begins for S. Augustine *there* where it inevitably begins for all human life. His argument becomes mysterious just where all life becomes mysterious ; and, if so, the very mystery becomes a pledge to the reality and rightness of his argument. Well would it have been if he had stayed his feet at the edge of the dark and inevitable abyss. He attempted the impossible task and left behind him, as the fruit of his rash effort, a terrible heritage of error, cut of the shadow of which man's wounded and stricken soul is but now securing its escape. Dr. Bright's tender but unhesitating judgment on the unfortunate exaggerations, into which his very passion of devotion to God drove the great Doctor as the controversy pressed, is given in the fiftieth page of his Introduction. We would urge all, who wish clearly to grasp the issues raised, to read the Professor's historic treatment of them, and then to turn to those wise and powerful propositions printed at the close of the volume, in which the Council of Orange summed up the Catholic judgment on this long war of thirty years.

Dr. Bright has simply reprinted the Benedictine text. After the Introduction he does not attempt any apparatus of notes or aids. The treatises are, we suppose, selected for him by the needs of the School of Theology ; otherwise it is impossible to resist a wish to have had one specimen treatise from the later stage of the discussion, in which Augustine had developed his statements on Predestination. Without this we are hardly carried through the whole argument, and a warning in the Preface would have forestalled any danger of misunderstanding. For the sake of this we could have spared the treatise *De Gestis Pelagii*, the argumentation of which hardly goes beyond the boundaries of the other treatises

given. One other little complaint we will allow ourselves: the headings of the sections, taken from Abbé Migne, are so slight as to be almost useless; they do not give the continuity of the argument, and have a disjointed and unmeaning air, and in many cases fail to fix on the prominent topic of the section they represent, and go off on a side issue: *e.g.* the heading to chapter lxvii. of the *De Naturâ et Gratiâ*: the comparison of sin with disease is quite incidental to the main gist and purpose of the chapter; or, again, in chapter-xxv. of the same treatise, the statement that 'certain heretics must be dealt with by prayer' conveys singularly little of the force of the chapter. These are but two slight instances of a general failing in most of the headings to be of any assistance to the reader towards grasping the distinctive character of the chapters. But we would not close with a complaint. We would rather express our hearty thanks to Dr. Bright for his bold and instructive Introduction to a most helpful volume.

ART. VIII.—THE SUNDAY SCHOOL CENTENARY.

1. *The Church and the Sunday School.* A Sermon preached in Gloucester Cathedral at the Sunday School Centenary. By C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.
2. *Certain Letters upon the Sunday School Centenary* in the *Guardian*. 1880.
3. *A Short Account of Sunday Schools in Hull.* 1803.

THE commemoration of the labours of Robert Raikes and the Rev. Thomas Stock has recently occupied the mind more or less of Englishmen throughout the world. Nonconformists as well as Churchmen, Australians as well as Englishmen, have vied with each other in paying honour by lectures and speeches and monster gatherings of children to the memory of the Gloucester printer and philanthropist, and to the importance of the Sunday-School movement. In these days of scepticism, when Homer is not permitted to own his ballads nor Shakspeare his plays, Raikes and his co-adjutor are not to enjoy the claim of original design unquestioned. A Methodist here and a Unitarian there, in a

preceding century, are known to have assembled and instructed outcast children during the leisure hours of the Lord's Day ; but as their individual labours began and ended with themselves, they could only be regarded as the big drops which precede the coming downpour. The successful and widespread efforts of the saintly Cardinal Charles Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan, in the sixteenth century, alone may challenge the men of Gloucester. None who have visited Milan Cathedral on a Sunday afternoon can forget the grand sight of boys in the southern aisle and girls in the northern, assembled in hundreds, to receive instruction by slates, and books, and lectures. Still, as for the last three centuries, knots of boys may be seen carrying a large cross, and their voices heard in chorus : ' Fathers and mothers, send your children to learn the Christian doctrine, or give an account for it to God.'

Long before the movement began in England, the influence of Milan had made itself felt in Roman Catholic countries, and Sunday Schools have been, if not universal, far from uncommon in Germany, France, and Italy. We could wish that this fact had been more generally recognized during the Centenary. The simple interests of truth demanded some fuller expression of Christian sympathy, although it is probable that ignorance of the facts, rather than a studied oversight, was chiefly to blame for a somewhat uncharitable omission. What S. Charles Borromeo did for his Archiepiscopal diocese, Robert Raikes and his colleague did for England. The union of a layman and a clergyman in laying the foundation of the system was a happy omen of that combined effort on the part of the clerical and the lay element in each congregation or parish in the benevolent work of Christianizing the neglected children of the poor. It would be a serious indictment against the entire system, if it could be shown that it relieved the clergy of the Church of England of the duty which, in the Rubrics and Canons, is imposed upon them, of publicly catechizing, *i.e.*, instructing their little ones orally, in the House of God. So far, however, is it from being true that the one must necessarily supplant the other, that it will be found that the public work of catechizing gives support and coherence to the other. It must, moreover, be borne in mind that the tendency of our national system of education will operate more and more to the extrusion of the religious element from the daily school, and to the same extent render the Sunday School a more indispensable institution of the Church, demanding all the resources which the clergyman can call into active operation.

Two questions naturally ask for an answer in connexion with the commemoration which has just taken place : 1. Does the Sunday School system deserve all the complimentary things that have been said of it? 2. Will the occasion have done anything to remove its blots, and to render it a more effective arm of the Church, using that term in its widest sense?

In attempting to give some reply to the former question, we bear in mind the serious charges which have been brought against it. It has been said that parents have been induced to take advantage of responsibility accepted by others, not only to omit their natural duty of instructing their own children in religious duties, but to abandon themselves to laziness and utter neglect of public worship on the Lord's Day. 'The parent now,' says the Bishop, the title of whose sermon stands above this article, 'far too commonly, simply sends the child to the Sunday School, and surrenders all the sacred duties of home-teaching to others, scarcely cares to inquire what it is that is taught, or how it is taught.' Statistics have been adduced in support of this grave accusation. But it may be said in extenuation that statistics are proverbially deceitful, and necessarily untrustworthy, unless the area that supplies them is sufficiently extensive to compensate for any local peculiarities. Again, the chaplain of one of H. M.'s prisons has given us a melancholy picture of the inefficiency of Sunday Schools to keep their pupils out of gaol. The testimony, such as it is, affords us no true argument against the success of the Sunday School system. Surely none are so irrational as to suppose that an hour or two's teaching out of the Church Catechism or the Creed can counteract the miserable influences of a drunken parent or an ungodly home. Has Mr. Horsley measured those influences with the result of his own lessons, given to the inmates *daily* in the quiet of their prison life, and can he record his experience of the result? He must do this, if his intention was to disparage the work of the Sunday School. The only inference we can properly draw is that all human institutions whatever, and even Divine institutions administered by human hands, are imperfect and full of blots.

The benefits, in short, of Sunday Schools are imponderable. We cannot predicate what the present condition of the poorer and more neglected classes would be at this moment had Raikes never lived, or had his unpaid army of volunteers never been called into active service. Before we can estimate the benefit which they have rendered to Society and to the

individual scholar, we must go to the wards of the hospital and listen to the last words that fall from the sick man's lips; we must follow the soldier dying from his shot wounds upon the battle-field, and discover the direction of his last thoughts; we must consult the sister of mercy and the Christian nurse, who, for the love of Christ and His children, devote themselves to the work of lessening and softening the sufferings of the sick, and learn from them how much more easy is the task of comforting or teaching in the case of those who have been taught to associate some real meaning with such words as *Redemption* and *Atonement*, and are already familiar with the facts of our Blessed Lord's life and death, before we have any right to question the amount of usefulness of which the Sunday School system has been productive.

A priori, those who entertain the notion of the uselessness of the Sunday School contradict the dictates of common sense. There is a moral force in *all* voluntary self-denying effort, which must produce effect as surely as any other moral or natural force. At the beginning of the movement, in the old city of the West, a century ago, women were at first *hired* for one or two shillings a Sunday, and we find at the end of fifteen or twenty years the enterprise had well-nigh failed. One or two earnest and noble-hearted youths then resolved that it should *not* fail, and to prevent the failure enlisted fellow-labourers in a purely voluntary adventure. Enthusiasm was soon aroused. The third annual report of the Sunday Schools established in Hull, in the first year of this century, lies before us. The Report speaks encouragingly of progress, and recites three several instances of personal conversion among the most depraved portion of the population. The benefit spread to the parents. 'The teachers,' the Report says:—

'have also had the satisfaction of knowing that the benefit of the instructions given to the children of the schools has extended to some of their parents. A poor woman, who has lately manifested a religious concern of mind, was asked whence it arose, and she replied that she had been deeply affected by hearing her two boys sing at home the hymns which they had learned at the Sunday School, and added, with tears, if children prayed to God and sung His praise, it was time their parents should do so too.'

During the late centenary we may remark, in passing, that there were not wanting proofs of the growing value of such indirect influence upon the children's homes. An anecdote related, we think, by Lord Shaftesbury still clings to our memory. A man and his wife had wandered into some church,

and the sermon had so wrought conviction upon their consciences, that they mutually made confession of their sinful past, but not knowing in what form to approach or address the Throne of Grace bethought themselves of awakening their Sunday School child, that she might teach them 'how to pray.'

The Hull Report was written in 1803. From that time advance has been made with such rapid strides that we now hear of *twelve millions* of scholars among our English-speaking population passing under the humanizing influences of *one million and a half* of volunteer teachers. It may be that these teachers are, like other volunteers, far less capable of drilling recruits than regular officers of the line; but it would be as incredible that water should refuse to rise to its level as that real and lasting benefit to society and to the Church should not follow so large an exercise of pure religious philanthropy, undertaken from a simple desire to promote the highest interests of these young children, and to awaken within them the consciousness of a higher destiny. If this million and a half of teachers are really animated with a high motive to look upon each one of these twelve millions of children as precious in his Creator's eyes, as a feeling, thinking, conscious *ego*, entering into all the relations of family, school, neighbourhood in childhood, and when some twenty years have rolled away combining them with fresh relations to the employer, to the new home, to the State, and to the Church, it is simply impossible to over-estimate the potentialities of this wide-spread system.

But there is confessedly another side to the picture. The Sunday School has not produced the results that might reasonably be expected of it. A hundred years are long enough to test the efficiency of any system. Children of unpromising parents have become fathers and grandfathers, who might be expected to exercise a 'godly influence' over their families; an influence which might reasonably aid, if not altogether supersede, the Sunday School. Yet Churchmen and Dissenters alike have to lament the same neglect of public worship among the labouring classes, the same indifference to all spiritual interests. So long as the 'missing link' between the Sunday School and the Church has not been found, it must be conceded that failure must be written over its past history, and the Centenary celebration will have served little purpose, if there has been spent too much time upon self-satisfied congratulations, too little upon well-directed efforts to supply its defects and to remove its blots. We shall now presume to point out what, in our opinion, those defects and blots are.

They have reference both to the children that are found in the schools, and to those who never come to them. As the attendance is voluntary, and positive punishments are out of the question, it is absolutely indispensable that the school should attract the children to itself; and to attract them it must be made attractive. Of course, personal manner and gentleness of treatment are in themselves attractive, but mistaken ideas of the *aims* and *methods* of instruction may go far to counteract their influences. Education is an art, and the art should be learned by the teacher of the Sunday as well as of the Day School. He should know the natural order in which a child's faculties are developed, if he would make his lessons not distasteful. He should deal with the child as the first Apostles did with the early Church, occupying him with the *facts* of the creed, rather than with the dogmas inferred from those facts. His teaching should be *concrete*, not abstract, showing *e.g.* what sin is, from conscious sinful actions, tempers, desires. He should lay upon the memory, in collect, hymn, or passages from Scripture, nothing that has not first passed through the understanding. His teaching, like that of the Great Teacher, should draw largely upon the child's great faculty of *imagination*, and be pictorial and vivid. The clergyman should meet his teachers weekly, and so, becoming the living link between the Church and School, show them on each occasion not only *what* to teach, but *how* to teach. The School would thus have cohesion as well as power.

If the Sunday School were made more attractive, the School age would advance, and the missing link between the School and Church be more likely to be found.

During the Centenary week, a great diversity of opinion manifested itself upon the function of a Sunday School as a teacher of definite doctrine. This diversity is the natural result of the variety that exists in the Day School. Where the clergyman has it in his power to reach his children daily in the class-room, and to make the religious lesson a real element of the every-day work of the School, the Sunday School is then at liberty to discharge its special mission as the awakener of religious consciousness, and the educator of religious feeling. The Sunday School teacher would in such cases simply aim at developing the inner power of a parable, or showing the force of a scriptural emblem. The school hour would be happily spent in listening to a story told by the teacher himself, or one read to the class by each member in turn, diversified by hymn and prayer. If, on the other hand,

the Day School be inaccessible to the clergyman, or too large for his individual instruction, and the children be shut out by the school regulations from all Church teaching, it is his clear duty, if he be faithful to his vows, to take the only opportunity which lies within his reach, and to make the Sunday School the organ of more definite instruction. But even then he must be careful not to attempt to make his children, in the first instance, subtle theologians or clever controversialists. They may become theologians, indeed, but be so without knowing it. A knowledge of the Church's doctrines, and of the reasons for remaining within the pale of the Church, should be the result, if possible, of indirect rather than direct teaching, in the first instance.

There can be no question, indeed, as to the value of the Church Catechism as a manual for teachers, as well as for catechumens. It was the wisdom of our forefathers to make the words of our Church Catechism an exercise of memory from the earliest years. A good teacher will follow the lines of the Catechism, and make its clear and definite utterances the basis of his oral interpretation and instruction. And even the mechanical repetition of the words, themselves imperfectly understood, may prove to be a most valuable help to the further instruction of ill-prepared children, when under instruction for Confirmation. The Rubric of the Prayer Book distinctly commands that all children should be publicly instructed 'in some part of this Catechism.' And the mind of the Church is plainly expressed that all its children should 'learn their Catechism.' It is, perhaps, to the neglect of this systematic teaching that we may attribute the melancholy fact that so many of the pupils of Church Sunday Schools drift away into Nonconformity or indifference. Older children, at least, ought certainly to be led, directly, and explicitly, to examine the foundations on which Christ laid His Church, if we are to expect them to abide, in after years, 'in the Apostles' fellowship' as well as in 'the Apostles' doctrine.' From the silence of the sacred writings as to their own witness to themselves, regarded as the foundation of the Church, and their clear witness to its foundation upon the Apostles, 'Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone;' from the promise left of His perpetual presence with His Church, and from His warning, and that of His inspired Apostles, to preserve a real and visible union; from the ordination of individual men, commissioned at definite places to 'set in order' what would otherwise fall into disorder, to supply 'what is wanting,' and to 'ordain presbyters;' the

children would receive some clear bias in favour of Church order, as against the disorder of uncontrolled private judgment. Are children too young to understand the evil of schism? We answer that they are not too young to understand the unity concretely taught by the Apostle under the figure of the human body :—' There is *one* Body,' as well as 'one Spirit.' The youngest child may comprehend that, if the illustration has any true significance, it implies organic unity. There may be two eyes and two feet, and two hands : but if there is to be order, and not disorder, in the body ; if hand is not to counteract hand, or foot foot ; there must be one brain to direct them all, and one heart to regulate the brain. Let only the natural method of instruction be adopted in the inculcation of Church teaching ; let the fundamental fact of all education be borne in mind, that children cannot be expected to sympathize with mere abstractions, and then the youngest Sunday School child may learn to know why he is, and why he ought to be, a Church child, and not a wanderer. Abstract dogmas, whether in respect to Church doctrine or Church discipline, may be learnt by the teacher, but they should be presented to the mind of the scholar in a shape in which they can be assimilated to his own conception and spiritual nature. Inattention to the natural method of opening an access to the child's mind for definite and clear doctrine has induced the majority of Church teachers to omit Church teaching altogether, and to limit instruction to those truths which the Church holds in common with the various forms of Dissent. The natural consequence of this colourless teaching is what we have to deplore, and what the colonies deplore, namely, that Church children grow up amongst ourselves, or arrive at distant lands, believing themselves at liberty to choose their spiritual teachers, as they choose their bakers and shoemakers.

It may be objected that the great majority of our volunteers are not intelligent enough, nor sufficiently acquainted with the technical methods of teaching, to follow the lines which have been laid down. Our reply is that the true remedy must be found in the technical education of the clergyman himself. The Chief Shepherd emphatically laid it upon His servant that he should ' feed His lambs,' and the prophet has beautifully pointed out that ' the lambs shall feed *after their manner*.' It is their manner to thrive upon milk, not upon hard roots. The Sunday School teacher must be the link between the lambs and the under-shepherd. He must learn from him at the teachers' weekly meeting in

what manner he should deal with the lesson of the following Sunday. Should it be objected that only a clergyman here and there is himself capable of understanding the intellectual wants of children, we reply that his own professional education has been radically defective if, when placed in charge of his fold, he is 'unapt to teach.'

The Centenary will have done some real work if our Bishops have had brought home to them the incapacity of many of the clergy as teachers and catechizers. Successful teaching is the foundation of successful preaching. The warden of the Theological College should be an enthusiastic teacher, from whose daily lectures, not only doctrinal or pastoral truths are conveyed, and lectures on the art of teaching delivered, but so conveyed and so delivered as to become living illustrations of such art. Were this made an integral part of the future clergyman's education, the bounden duty of public catechizing would not, as now, be shamefully and regularly shirked as an unpalatable task, but the child would grow up, looking back with feelings of happy association upon the Church as well as school, interested in the lessons of the pulpit in after life, and able to give a reason to the infidel why he is a Christian, and to the separatist why he is a Churchman after the manner of his fathers.

To supply the missing link between the School and Church, the clergyman must keep his eye upon his children emerging from childhood. He must look, not only to his teachers, his appliances and his methods, but to *himself*. He has now, more than ever, to deal with voluntary attendance, when threats and penalties, school feasts and bribes, are of no avail. His only weapon is personal influence. To secure this influence, he must not only look for a teacher of a Sunday Bible-class similarly endowed with himself, but become to his band of young men the everyday 'guide, philosopher, and friend.' He must follow them to their homes and their trades; he must encourage them to consult with him in all their difficulties and temptations. He must call to his aid the appliances of Church guilds, and engage them in one or other of the various departments of Church work. On Sundays he should muster them under some competent volunteer in class-rooms, separated from the younger children, in the vestry, or in his own house. He should make his instruction much more elastic, so as to cover the *works* of God in nature as well as His Word. He should make his ideas familiar with the modes of Divine government in both, and with the consequences of disobedience to Divine law, whether written in the moral or

physical world. A French curé once complained to an eminent philosopher of the apathy and irreverence of his congregation. 'Tell them,' said the philosopher, 'of the glorious wonders of creation: that each star is a sun with its attendant planets, that those streaks of brightness in the sky are composed of indistinguishable dust of such suns, separated from each other by millions and millions of miles, whose light takes thousands and tens of thousands of years of lightning-like velocity to reach our globe.' When next they met, the curé, in reply to the inquiry as to how he fared with the experiment, exclaimed, 'O, worse than ever; they were excited and irreverently clapped their hands in Church, and cried *bravo!*' It will be hard to prove the impropriety of tracing the love and Fatherhood of God, even on a Sunday, in Nature, Providence and History, as well as Grace. Better still, perhaps, it would be to hold a weekday class as well, when no traditional scruples would interfere, and opportunity would be more freely offered for discussing the beauties of our best poets, and enforcing the lessons of sanatory and economic science. An occasional ramble into the country, in view of the green fields, the blue sky, and the rolling waves, with the opportunity of

'Making sweet friendship with the stones and flowers,'

would immensely add to the personal influence of such an outgrowth of the Sunday School.

For lack of space we must pass over our views upon the 'methods' as distinguished from 'appliances,' and speak of the clergyman himself in his relation to the elder youth of the humbler rank. We have already spoken of the charge brought against the Sunday School, that it has relieved the clergyman of the duty imposed upon him of instructing and catechizing his children in their early years. It would be an indictment of a graver character still if it could be shown that the clergyman devolved upon others the inalienable duty of advising and watching over his young men during that eventful period when each

'Steps into life and follows unrestrained
Where Passion leads or Prudence points the way.'

A felt interest and a true sympathy is all that is needed. For want of this the youth turns his back upon school, and church, and parson, to none of which he may have felt much attraction. He is now powerfully influenced from *within* and from *without*. The sense of independence and the

proud consciousness of self-support, as he begins to earn his own wages on the one hand, and the allurements of doubtful companions and the natural longing for fresh air on the other, are forces antagonistic to the clergyman's Sunday School, if there be no such counteracting force of sympathy and comprehension of the difficulties of the situation. What then should the clergyman do? He should look for the required influence in himself, as he meets his old Sunday School scholar in the clubs and guilds of the parish. He should meet him in the temperance hall or the coffee club, or the choir practice, or the concert room. He should meet him in a botany or geology class, or in whatever department he has himself a speciality. If a cricketer, he should not be ashamed to don the flannel trousers, and show with his willow how fields are won. Add to all this shorter and brighter services, and still shorter and brighter sermons, simple, human, searching; above all, add free and open access to God's House, where each can worship the Fatherhood in the bonds of a common brotherhood; in short, let the youth of the future find and feel his place in the Church of Christ, Who would 'give to *every man* His work' amidst the minor ministries of life. Then when the next Centenary shall come round, the missing link will be found to give strength, consistency, and completion to the chain which binds the hearts of the young to the Church of the Redeemer. Meanwhile be it ours to work or blunder on in faith. He, who loved the little ones, will own and bless all who with so much patience and faith and love are trying, as best they may, to crush out evil from these young hearts. That work cannot be lost, so long as it is carried on for love to Him, Who was Himself once so little in the cradle of Bethlehem.

The object of this paper has been not to depreciate the loving labours of true-hearted Christian volunteers, who sacrifice their Sunday rest from a real love to the souls of the young whom they gather round them. Our desire is to point out the duty of giving to the work a more definite aim and purpose, but so to give it as to make it acceptable and pleasing to those whose affections we wish to win to the side of the Church, as against an active and ever-fluctuating Dissent, of faith, as against a prevailing unbelief, and of our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ, as against that animalism and devotion to the things that perish which everywhere characterize so large a portion of the working classes.

ART. IX.—CONFIRMATION.

1. *What is the Distinctive Grace of Confirmation?* A paper read before the chapter of the South Eastern Division of the Upper Llandaff Rural Deanery. By F. W. PULLER, B.A., Vicar of Roath. (London, 1880.)
2. *Χρίσμις τελειωτική.* *A Discourse of Confirmation.* By JEREMY [TAYLOR], Lord Bishop of Down. (1664.)
3. *The Seal of the Lord.* A Catechism on Confirmation with appropriate Devotions, unto which is added a Form of Daily Prayer for Young Persons. By A. P. FORBES, Bishop of Brechin. 120th thousand. (London, 1879.)
4. *Confirmation, or, Are you ready to serve Christ?* By the Right Reverend ASHTON OXENDEN, D.D., late Bishop of Montreal. 512th thousand. (London, 1880.)
5. *Notes for Lectures on Confirmation*, with suitable prayers. By C. J. VAUGHAN, D.D., Master of the Temple. 11th Edition. (London, 1878.)
6. *Instructions and Devotions for Candidates for Confirmation.* By the Rev. B. WEBB, M.A., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Wells Street, 2nd Edition. (London, 1877.)
7. *Catechism on Confirmation.* With Directions and Devotions. By a COMMITTEE OF CLERGY. 130th thousand. (London, 1879.)
8. *The Rite of Confirmation.* A Catechism by the Rev. CHARLES S. GRUEBER. (London, 1879.)

BISHOP GRAHAM of Chester once told a story which is worth remembering. At the time when the theological term Regeneration was attracting much attention, it was proposed that the Bishops of England should issue a common document, which should carry weight from its unanimity. When they had met together, and had discussed the question for a time, Bishop Graham suggested that the best plan would be for each Bishop to write down his own definition of the term 'Regeneration' as a preliminary. This proposal commended itself to the Bishops, who at once dipped their pens with a view of carrying it out. Words, however, did not flow freely from the pens, and at last one by one the Bishops left the room, and two only were left, Bishop Wilberforce, and Bishop Graham, who looked up, and said with a smile, 'I do not think, my Lord, we two shall agree in a definition.'

At the present time, if the Bishops had to write down each his own view of Confirmation, it is scarcely probable that they would be so much at a loss. The constant administration of the sacred rite, accompanied as it now is with one or more addresses, would do much to forward the formation of opinion. It is true that every parochial Clergyman must be perfectly familiar with the Baptismal Service, and yet that many discrepant views have been held about Baptism. For too often the words become familiar, without producing much effect upon the reason, and men use the words without fully recognizing the teaching they convey. The fact also may be that the reasoning powers are not much called upon in the administration of Baptism. Few, except in the larger towns, have to prepare candidates for adult Baptism, and Bishops are rarely chosen from men who have had experience in large towns. It is otherwise with Confirmation. From the moment a man is ordained, preparation for Confirmation comes practically before him, and he has to make up his mind on its teaching. This is true even of schoolmasters, who feel it a part of their duty to shape the moral and spiritual development of their pupils, and often undertake their preparation for Confirmation.

It is however very much to be feared, that if the Bishops individually wrote down their views of Confirmation, nine-tenths of the result would be unrecognizable by the judges, to whose verdict the Church of England incessantly refers, 'the holy and ancient learned fathers and doctors.' If we may judge from the addresses given by the Bishops, and from the general consensus of books issued as helps to the parochial clergy in the matter, Confirmation is still too often regarded as merely an edifying ceremony, wherein the candidate takes the vows of Baptism upon himself in a solemn manner, and relieves the god-parents¹ from their responsibility. Some again say in a similar strain that it is a special time of choice, when the young person, having arrived at the maturity of the reasoning powers, is to make a choice between a religious and a worldly life. This is the constant theme of one of our Bishops in his addresses: so that

¹ Alexander Ales thought himself justified in foisting this view into his translation of the Prayer-Book. In his rendering (*Ordinatio Ecclesie*, &c., Lipsiæ, 1551) the second initial rubric before the Confirmation Service commences thus, 'Primo, ut pueri propriam fidem confiteantur, et se ratam habere. testentur confessionem, quam Patrini eorum nomine fecerunt in Baptismo, et ut Patrini exonerentur illa sponsione facta pro infantibus Ecclesie?'

he invariably tells the candidates, that if they do not feel that they can, then and there, once for all give up all desire for a worldly life, they had better not come up to him to be confirmed. This solemn appeal, at a time when the feelings of the young are naturally highly wrought, has been productive of a result the reverse of that which was intended; so much so that one of the most trusted of his clergy has been accustomed to assemble his candidates for a last general address, and then bid them not pay heed to the Bishop's appeal.

This strangely low view of Confirmation prevails even where we should expect a greater attention to the teaching of antiquity, so as to be somewhat startling in its general adoption. It is found, for instance, in the published addresses of the learned Bishop Kaye of Lincoln, as well as in the popular writings of Bishop Oxenden.¹

If this be the true meaning and end of Confirmation, the rite is a purely modern invention, and we may well believe it to be, what Melancthon called it, an 'otiosa cæremonia : ' and (though the Wesleyans a few years back wished to invent a similar ceremony) yet such a ceremony would be one of purely human origin, and we could well do without it. For we must never forget that the renewal of the baptismal vows, edifying and advantageous though it be, was introduced first into the English Office Book at the last review in 1662, and has no place in any other known office book. Before that time the Bishop was directed to test the children publicly in the Catechism, in which they had been previously publicly instructed. If therefore Confirmation be the subjective acceptance of their position by young Christians, it is a ceremony peculiar to the modern English Church : and even in the Church of England it is an usage only two hundred years old, and, though a suitable and laudable ceremony, a merely human institution.

It is pretty clear that the Bishops in 1662 did not think they were doing otherwise than perpetuating an Apostolic ordinance. For the Nonconformists (who had been probably specially stirred by the recent attack on Confirmation by Daillé) objected to Confirmation, and to the service in which it was administered, declaring that the Articles stated it to be a corrupt following of the Apostles. The Bishops told them in

¹ Archbishop Wake is an illustrious exception. In his *Commentary* on the Church Catechism he says : 'We piously presume that, by the fervent prayers of the Bishop and the Church, those on whom he now lays his hands shall also receive the Holy Ghost, if they do but worthily prepare themselves for it.'—(Part VI. *Of Confirmation.*)

answer that they were mistaken : that the Articles did not say as they would interpret them, and that Confirmation was an Apostolic rite. But though the Bishops gave this answer to the 'ministers,' they introduced alterations in the Confirmation Service, which, however edifying or excellent their design, are capable of a most unfortunate interpretation.

The alterations seem to have been due to Cosin, who can hardly have accepted a low view of the rite. Only one alteration, the introduction of the Lord's Prayer, was for the better. The previous omission must point to a time when Confirmation was part and parcel of the Baptismal Office : for it is hard to suppose any service complete without this prayer. One rubric which has been omitted we can ill spare ; it specially said that the grace of Confirmation was to give 'strength and defence against all temptations to sin, and the assaults of the world and the devil.' The next rubric used words which again linked us on to the old Canon Law in the West, which required that candidates should be '*perfectæ ætatis*:' 'it was ordained (it said) that Confirmation should be administered to them that were of *perfect age*.' The adoption of part of another rubric as an address brings into prominence a word which most probably was originally a misprint. In 1549 the wording ran that children should '*ratify and confess*' their baptismal vows, make open profession of their faith ; this is spoken of later on as their '*confession*.' In 1552 this became '*ratify and confirm*,' though if the alteration were intended, the latter word would probably have been '*Confirmation*' instead of '*Confession*.' Still, however it be, the altered word now finds a place in the text of the address, and gives some shadow of reason to one of our Bishops, who, with lack of humour, as well as of theology, invariably addresses the candidates, 'You who are going to confirm.' Again, the introduction of the question and answer gives a kind of colour to the same view ; while, lastly, the alteration in the title (especially as it appears in the Table of Contents) seems to degrade the office. No longer is it '*Confirmation*, where also is a Catechism,' but it now runs '*The Catechism*, with the order of Confirmation.' In the older form '*Confirmation*' was the important and prominent rite for which the Catechism was a continuous preparation ; in the present '*The Catechism*' seems to assert a pre-eminence.

It is not easy to give reasons for these alterations ; probably many influences were at work. For ten years Confirmation had been in general abeyance ; the 'ministers,' in their rejoinder, drew attention to the 'thousands in England that

never yet came under the Bishop's hands.' It may have been thought well to make the administration of the ceremony more generally edifying and popular. Still it is much to be feared that from their action for some reason or another, and from the general tendency of men to lessen their obligations and depreciate their privileges, there have resulted the modern weak and low views of Confirmation prevalent amongst ourselves.

The paper of Mr. Puller, the title of which comes first at the head of this article, is an earnest attempt to recall attention, where it has flagged, to the high importance of Confirmation arising from the distinctive grace which this ordinance conveys to the Christian soul. It is carefully compiled and modestly written, and it is very much to be hoped that it will reach the eyes of the Bishops and their advisers.

Pointing out that the Church of England claims to depend upon the Holy Scriptures as explained in the Early Church, Mr. Puller carefully examines the full witness of Scripture to the gift conveyed in Confirmation, and then appeals to the testimony of the Fathers. He argues 'that Confirmation sets up in the soul a new relation to the Holy Ghost which it had not before ; so that, although in baptism the Holy Ghost operates and works on the soul by His purifying, consecrating, regenerating influence, yet that He does not impart His indwelling Presence until He is given in a new way by the laying on of hands.' We can scarcely follow him to this trenchant conclusion.

His view is supported, however, by arguments which command attention, if not conviction. For the Scriptural argument we must refer to Mr. Puller's book itself. The whole question of the conveyance of the gift of Regeneration to the Apostles is most mysterious. The Church ever regarded the actions of our Lord at His Last Supper as full of the deepest mystery ; but there has been no consensus of opinion about the teaching of the girding Himself, or of the lavipedium. Mr. Puller maintains that the gift of Regeneration was granted to the Apostles by the breathing on them in the evening of the first Easter Day. This would answer to the gift now bestowed on us in Baptism ; the glories of Pentecost being reserved as the special grace of Confirmation. In our Blessed Lord's own Person the early Fathers delighted to see the distinction between His baptism in Jordan by S. John, and His subsequent and consequent Confirmation by the FATHER on the bank of the Jordan, when descent of the HOLY SPIRIT was manifested by the fluttering and settling of somewhat after

the manner of a dove.¹ Similarly S. Peter in his sermons combines, and yet separates, Baptism and Confirmation; as, for example, when a short time after the illapse of the Holy Spirit in Pentecost, he said: ² (1) 'Repent, (2) and be baptized for the remission of sins, (3) and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.' This answers wonderfully to the 'principles of the doctrine of Christ,' as given by the Apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews: ³ the first four of which are (1) Repentance, (2) Faith, (3) Baptism, (4) Laying on of hands, or Confirmation.

If we look to the present teaching of the Church we find that in the East there is little difference from the primitive doctrine, whereas in the West there has been a change.

Mr. Puller gives a quotation from a French translation of a theological treatise by a Russian Bishop, which does not vary from the earliest teaching. In the *Ὁρθόδοξος Ὁμολογία*, issued by the authority of the Eastern Patriarchs and chief theologians⁴ in 1643, the same is expressed. The following will be found on p. 161 sq. of the Leipsig edition of 1695: ⁵

‘τὸ δεύτερον μυστήριον εἶναι τὸ μύρον τοῦ χρίσματος· τὸ ὅποιον ἤρχισεν ἀπὸ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον, ὅπου τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκατάβηκεν εἰς τοὺς Ἀποστόλους . . . ἀπὸ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο γενοῦνται οἱ καρποὶ τοῦτο· Πρῶτον, διατὶ καθὼς μὲ τὸ βάπτισμα ἀναγενόμεθα, τέτοιας λογῆς μὲ τὸ ἅγιον μύρον γενόμεθα μέτοχοι τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, βεβαιωθέντες εἰς τὴν πίστιν τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ αὐξάνομεν εἰς τὴν θείαν χάριν . . . Δεύτερον, διατὶ μὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος οὕτως εἰμεσθεν βεβαίοι καὶ στερεοὶ ὅπου δὲν ἡμπορεῖ νὰ βλάβῃ καθόλου ὁ νοητὸς ἐχθρὸς τὴν ψυχὴν μας.’

At present the best recognized Greek Catechism is that of Plato, Metropolitan of Moscow, first published in 1765; it was issued in English with a most interesting preface by Robert Pinkerton in 1814. Of Confirmation he says: ⁶—

‘Through this holy ordinance, *the Holy Ghost descendeth upon the person baptized*, and confirmeth him in the grace which he received in his baptism according to the example of His descending upon the

¹ Bishop Jeremy Taylor, *Χρίσις τελειωτική*, § 1, i.

² Acts ii. 38.

³ Heb. vi. 1.

⁴ It was drawn up by Petrus Mogilas, Metropolitan of Kieff, revised by Meletius Syrigus, protosyncellus of Constantinople, and issued with the signature of the patriarchs and theologians.

⁵ The fruits of Baptism are said to be (1) Forgiveness of Sins; (2) Regeneration; (3) Membership in the Body of Christ.

⁶ *The Present State of the Greek Church in Russia*. By Robert Pinkerton. Edinburgh, 1814, p. 178. The translation was made from the Slavonic, and fairly represents the Greek version, which omits the word ‘visibly’ altogether, as indeed would be expected.

disciples of Jesus Christ, and in imitation of the disciples themselves, who, after baptism, laid their hands upon the believers; by which laying on of the hands of the Apostles, the Holy Ghost was [visibly] conferred.¹

In some modern manuals there seems to be an approximation to Western doctrine, and the *χαρίσματα* are more emphasized as the special gifts of Confirmation.¹

In the West, however, this grand teaching became gradually obscured, because (as it would seem) the bishops became less careful of their duties. Confirmation was less frequently and so less surely administered, and, in consequence, less importance became attached to it. In the East, Confirmation has been for many centuries administered by the priest (as the deputy of the Bishop) immediately after Baptism,² with Holy Chrism, consecrated specially for this

¹ Cf. Σειρά ἐγκυκλίων μαθημάτων πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν ἱερατικῶν σχολείων. Τομὸς Ε'. Ἐν Ἀθήναις, 1870, p. 73. Ἐπιστολαὶ περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀκολουθιῶν τῆς ἀνατολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. Ἀθήνησι, 1851, p. 134 *seq.* These extremely interesting letters were published in S. Petersburg, and translated from the fifth edition into Greek. The following extracts seem to display Western influence: —‘Before we come to write about the service for Holy Baptism, I must remind you that, as all the mysteries in general have the force of communicating to us the grace of the Holy Spirit, so each of them contains peculiarly in itself its own proper gift of the Holy Spirit, under somewhat we can feel and see.’ After having described the ceremonial of Baptism, ‘Then candles are given to the sponsors in token of that immaterial light which enlightened the infant, and made him fit to receive the second mystery given by chrism of ointment, viz. *perfectness in the faith*. As in Baptism the man is spiritually washed by water from the filth of sin, so in the anointing, viz., when the body is anointed with the chrism, the regenerate one is sealed and stablished (*στερεοῦται*) in the truth of the faith, and then are communicated to him the spiritual virtues of grace (*κοινωνοῦνται αὐτῷ αἱ πνευματικαὶ δυνάμεις τῆς χάριτος*), because of the contests which are required of the Christian.’ In the other Catechisms we have seen, the work of Plato is taken as the basis. Κατήχησις ἡ ὀρθόδοξος διδασκαλία. Ἀθήνησι, 1868—used in the High School of Smyrna, and commended in an encyclical letter by Cyril, Patriarch of Constantinople. Σύνοψις ἱερᾶς κατήχησεως, ὑπὸ Β. Δ. Καλλιφρονος ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, 1869. Κατήχησις ἡ τοῦ ὀρθόδοξου Χριστιανικῆς διδασκαλίας (translated from the Russian), 1851. See also *Exposition de la doctrine de l'Eglise Catholique Orthodoxe*, par W. Guetée, prêtre. Paris et Londres, 1866, p. 131. The Synodical answer, drawn up in 1672, and included in those sent to the Nonjurors in 1718, is not very explicit:—‘The second [sacrament] is that of the Holy Ointment, by which we receive spiritual strength, to enable us to speak boldly the belief of our hearts.’—*The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, by George Williams, B.D., Rivingtons, 1868, p. 69.

² Some writers, therefore, do not separate between the distinctive graces of the two. ‘Ἀμφότερα τὰ μυστήρια ταῦτα ἀπαρτίζον ἐν τι ὅλῳ, καὶ ἡνωμένα, ὡς νῦν, ἐπετελοῦντο ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ πρὸ τῆς λειτουργίας, ἵνα οἱ βαπτισθέντες κοινωνήσωσι τῶν ἀχράντων μυστηρίων. Ἀμφότερα εἶναι ἡ θύρα εἰς

purpose by the Metropolitan. In the West, for some time, it was admitted that a priest might be specially empowered in some cases to convey the gift of Confirmation, but, gradually, (we need not say as the Venerable Bede does, 'propter arrogantiam'), it became rigidly restricted to the episcopal order. At the same time, bishops, as a rule, became more and more worldly (with great and shining exceptions), and from lust of power were so much occupied in politics and pomp that the Confirmation of the young was neglected. This appears from many hints from many quarters. In the *Magna Vita* of S. Hugh, of Lincoln,¹ we read that a proud young bishop would not so much as get off his horse to bestow the grace of Confirmation, but would anoint the children with the consecrated chrism sitting on his horse (*equo sublimis*) while his attendants buffeted and scolded the children for being afraid of the kicking and fighting horses of the bishop's courtiers. Neglect like this must have fostered low views of the ordinance, though Sanders² tells us that in England Confirmation was more sought after and valued than in any other nation. As it was now divorced from Baptism,³ it became necessary that the child should have cause to remember his Confirmation, because, 'though in a Christian country it is presumed that every one is baptized, it does not follow that every one is confirmed.'⁴ Much dependence, therefore, had to be placed on the child's memory. When the father of Benvenuto Cellini wished him to remember having seen a salamander, he boxed his ears; so the ceremony of a slap on the face was added to Confirmation, to impress the child's memory.⁵ It seems to have been in the thirteenth century

τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐπομένως ἡ ἀρχὴ τῶν ἄλλων Μυστηρίων.' *Λειτουργικὴ ὑπὸ Π. Ῥομπότου—ἐν Ἀθῆναις*, 1869, p. 259. This reminds us of the language of S. Cyprian:—'Tunc enim demum plenè sanctificari et esse filii Dei possunt, si *sacramento utroque* nascantur, cum scriptum sit, "Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu, non potest introire in regnum Dei."' Ep. lxxii. Ad Stephanum de Concilio, Parisiis, 1726, p. 128. See also the next Epistle, Ad Jubaianum, p. 136. S. Hilary of Poitiers also has the phrase 'in Baptismi et Spiritus Sacramentis' (*Comm. in S. Mat. cap. iv. § 27*).

¹ *Magna Vita*, ed. Dimock, London, 1864, p. 140.

² Sanders *de Schismate Anglicano*, Ingoldstadt, 1586, p. 262. William of Paris, in the thirteenth century, as quoted by Bp. Taylor, speaks of the neglect in his time: 'Propter cessationem confirmationis tepiditas grandior est in fidelibus, et fidei defensione.'

³ The chrismatio in Baptism amongst the Latins, and the signature of the cross amongst ourselves, testify to the ancient combination of the rites.

⁴ Silvestrina, *Summa*, s.v. Confirmatio.

⁵ It is true that Klee (*Les Dogmes Chrétiens*, French translation,

that the custom began of delaying Confirmation till the child was of 'perfect age,' (which is explained to mean twelve years old, when he would be capable of minor orders,¹) that his reason might be educated as a better preparation for the grace. This, again, gave rise to a declaration of faith being required from the candidate, and the notion gradually gained ground that the rite was more a duty required of the recipient than a means of a direct gift from God.

It is easy to understand, therefore, that the reformers should make light of that which was now spoken of in a different manner than was to be found in Scripture or the earlier Fathers. No wonder that Melancthon said: ² 'ritus Confirmationis quem nunc retinent Episcopi est prorsus otiosa cæremonia.' No wonder that Daillé attacked, and Basnage mocked at, Confirmation; for when Sainte-Beuve answered Daillé he had to weaken his own argument by explaining and weakening the statements of the Fathers. Over and over again he has to say: ³ 'Gratia sanctificans intelligitur per hanc vocem, *Spiritus Sanctus*.' His position would have been much stronger if he could have shown, as the Eastern Church can, that the same teaching remains, without need of explanation, as it was gathered from the inspired writings by the Earliest Church.

In England we have inherited from the Western Church the custom of deferring Confirmation till some years after infant baptism. This has led to a confusion of teaching until with some there is no room left at all for Confirmation.⁴ At Paris, 1848, tom. ii. p. 233), following S. Carlo Borromeo, tries to speak of this as the knightly accolade of the Christian soldier, but that is not the general explanation. Martene (*de Ritibus*, tom. i. p. 91, Antwerp, 1763) says he cannot find the alapa mentioned earlier than in Durandus in the thirteenth century. We read of something like it in the twelfth. When S. Hugh of Lincoln had been confirming in a village, and was just starting to the next, an old peasant came in, and declined to walk to the next village, for the rite. S. Hugh confirmed him, and then gave him 'a severe slap in the face for having so long delayed the holy rite.' Perry's *Life of St. Hugh*, p. 229.

¹ Gratian, *Decretum III. De Consec. dist. v. cap. vi. glos.*

² *Loci Theologici: Corpus Doctrinæ*, Strasburg, 1580, p. 494. His statement that Confirmation 'olim fuit exploratio doctrinæ, in qua singuli recitabant summam doctrinæ,' appears wholly destitute of foundation.

³ *Tractatus de Sacramentis Confirmationis et Unctionis Extremæ*, auctore Jacobo de Sainte-Beuve.—Lutetiæ Parisiorum, 1686, p. 26, 141, &c.

⁴ It has been possible for the S.P.C.K. to publish the following:—'Every one who is united to Christ in Holy Baptism is placed in the Kingdom of Heaven; receives all the blessings which are given to the members of that kingdom on earth in virtue of his union with Christ; all the gifts of the Holy Ghost; he inherits these blessings at once'!!

present there seems to be increasing a happy inclination of the Bishops to admit candidates at an earlier age than was customary a few decades back, so that there may be some hope of restoring the primitive teaching, as the primitive practice is approached. To this teaching Mr. Puller's paper is a valuable handbook, and may perhaps reach those who would avoid a longer treatise. The *Discourse of Confirmation* by Bishop Jeremy Taylor will prove very useful reading after Mr. Puller, and it will be a great blessing if wider attention can be gained for their teaching. For we are bound to remember that individual Fathers and Councils have maintained that none had a right to be regarded as a perfect Christian until he had received the grace of Confirmation.¹ If the main object of the rite be the conveyance to the soul of the 'unspeakable gift' of God, it can scarce be administered at too early an age. Parish priests in the country have too frequent experience of the fall into sin of adult candidates on their return from the distant Church appointed for the Confirmation. One good might be drawn from the presence of so many *otiosi Episcopi* in England, and Confirmations might be held yearly in almost every village as well as town; then none could speak of it as an *otiosa cæremonia*.

If this be the teaching about Confirmation, it may be asked, what should be the preparation? In the East it is clear that none is required; the infant is baptized, confirmed, communicated, at one and the same time and place. The Church of England requires that children should be taught the Catechism, and be catechized in public, 'so soon as they shall be able to learn.' If only these directions were carried out, the great majority of books issued as helps to preparation for Confirmation would be rather helps to catechizing. They might be called preparations for going to Church, or for saying the Confession, or for saying the Creed, or for saying the *misereres* after the Commandments, which are in effect renewals of the baptismal vows. Of this sort are Dr. Vaughan's *Notes for Lectures on Confirmation*, which have scarce anything to do with Confirmation. At best they might be used as a class-book of colourless teaching for a weekly lesson on religious topics to children in the elder half of grammar schools.

But what can be said about Bishop Oxenden's *Confirmation, or, Are you ready to serve Christ?* It does not speak

¹ S. Thomas determines: *Moriturus hoc sacramentum dandum est ut in resurrectione perfecti appareant.*—Pars III., quæ. lxxii., art. viii. § 4.

highly for the spiritual or intellectual calibre of English-speaking candidates or their teachers, that this small tract should have reached a sale of more than half a million. No word is said in it of any grace being conferred in the rite. The acute Mr. Spurgeon has recorded a severe estimate of the Bishop's works in terse terms, which may be thought to apply to this tract. He says: 'Why Oxenden's books sell we do not know. We would not care to have them for a gift. "Milk for babes," watered beyond measure.'¹

For Confirmation there should be special distinctive preparation, after proper catechetical instruction in previous years. For this previous catechizing, Dr. Mill's notes² are perhaps unequalled for concise suggestiveness as far as they go. But for the special instruction Bishop Forbes' *Seal of the Lord* is very useful, and so is the *Catechism* of the Committee of Clergy, though perhaps both are too short. Those who think a fuller manual is more needed will find what they want in Mr. Webb's practical *Instructions and Devotions for Candidates for Confirmation*, a manual meant especially as a text-book for the oral teaching of a class of more educated catechumens. Mr. Grueber's catechism will hardly be found of so much use with candidates. It is more adapted *ad clerum*.

We owe a great debt of gratitude to Mr. Puller for having drawn attention to our shortcomings. Much is due to him for the manner, as well as the matter, of his treatise; for while the matter is a somewhat severe rebuke to our present practice, the manner of his writing entirely disguises the reproof, or, at worst, makes it very palatable. The matter is the work of a learned and thoughtful scholar; the manner is that of a Christian priest.

That we have inherited our present laxity in practice and doctrine from the mediæval Latin Church is pretty clear from the very name *Confirmatio*. Such a name is not to be found in any ancient Father.³ The nearest name in Greek is *τελειωσις*, which S. Ambrose would represent as *Perfectio*, S. Cyprian as *Consummatio*. But *Confirmatio* would only imply a buttress to strengthen a building already complete, whereas the other names imply the addition of somewhat of material importance to the completeness of the structure, and not merely its stability. At the beginning of the seventh century

¹ *Commenting and Commentaries*, London, 1876, p. 149.

² *Lectures on the Catechism*, Bell and Daldy, 1856.

³ The word is found in the second Canon of the first Council of Orange, A.D. 441; but after much explanation the Canon remains obscure.

S. Isidore of Seville does not use the word *confirmatio*, but at the end of the century, Sonnatius, Archbishop of Rheims, uses it, and Theodore of Tarsus has it in his Capitula; in the ninth century it was in common acceptance. By somewhat emphasizing the laxity, we in England have departed still further from the practice and doctrine of the Primitive Church. The best way of acknowledging our indebtedness to Mr. Puller is to further his view as much as possible, for we have much to regret and much to learn.

The practical conclusion will be that Confirmation must be held as of far greater importance than for the last couple of hundred years or so it has been regarded. The Bishops must be urged to encourage the presentation of children at an earlier age. The present Archbishop of Canterbury must be aware that it requires some moral courage for a young man to offer himself when of fully adult age. In too many cases the rite is postponed so long as to be finally neglected. The late Baron Alderson learned late in life the lesson that Mr. Puller would teach, and was confirmed at an advanced age at Christ Church, Albany Street. We have known of a case in which a very eminent statesman refused to allow his sons to go to a great public school until they had been confirmed and had become communicants, in order that they might have full supplies of grace to enable them to meet the dangers which would surround them.

One objection will unquestionably be raised to the earlier age for which we would plead. There will be a missing of the edifying ceremony of an intelligent renewal of the baptismal vows. It would hardly consort with the 'spirit of the age' to suggest a rehabilitation of the Canon of 1571, which refuses to let any one contract marriage or be a god-parent, who cannot aptly answer all parts of the Catechism; but an earlier age for Confirmation would necessitate the institution amongst ourselves of a 'Catéchisme de persévérance,' the need of which the Board School system has brought into prominence. The children would soon learn that they cannot say their prayers without practically renewing or acknowledging their allegiance to their baptismal vows.

Another objection would arise perhaps from the extra work, which, at all events at first, it would entail on the Bishops. One method of obviating this has already been referred to; another, which Bingham tells us was suggested in the Mediæval Church, is in full progress in our midst. 'The Canons in some places obliged Bishops to visit their whole dioceses once every year; and if they were so large that they could not do

so, then they were to divide their dioceses and make them less.'

Still if the practice cannot be amended, the truer doctrine must be preached and taught. 'Si in hoc Episcoporum negligentia peccatum est hactenus, negligentia damnetur, non id quod per se bonum est,' wrote George Witzel three centuries and a half ago; in whose further suggestion we would earnestly join:—'Consulantur de hoc mystico ritu antiqui Canones, et renovetur ita actus ille sacer ut de baptizatorum atque in fide Christiana Confirmatorum profectu gaudeat universa panegyris Christianorum.'¹

ART. X.—SOME RECENT EPISCOPAL CHARGES.

1. *Ten Addresses at the Triennial Visitation of the Cathedral Church and Diocese of Lincoln.* By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln. (Lincoln and London, 1879.)
2. *Six Addresses on the Being of God.* By C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. (London, 1880.)
3. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Lichfield at his Primary Visitation.* By WILLIAM DALRYMPLE MACLAGAN, D.D., Ninety-first Bishop. (London, 1880.)
4. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Diocese of Worcester, at his Visitation in June, 1880.* By HENRY, Lord Bishop of Worcester. (London, 1880.)

THE 'opinions of those who are of highest authority in the Church should by right claim our respectful attention, though they may not at all times command our assent. Bishops' charges are in some sort their 'ex cathedrâ judgments,' before which John Henry Newman was wont to quail. 'Di me terrent, et Jupiter hostis,' he exclaimed; 'it is because the Bishops go on charging against me' that I fear. We may be able to regard with greater equanimity episcopal utterances,

¹ *Wicelii Methodus Concordiæ*, cap. viii., and *Via Regia*. These will be found in the appendix to Brown's *Fasciculus Rerum Expetendarum*, London, 1690, p. 759 and p. 710.

and sometimes even venture to criticize the actions of 'Jupiter hostis' himself; still, in all seriousness, the solemn expressions of opinion which Bishops deliver in their charges, whether upon doctrines of the faith, ceremonial practices, or questions before Parliament, must and ought to have great moral weight. That they are not infallible is but too evident, because they are not infrequently contrary to one another. A comparison even of those charges mentioned at the head of this article would supply instances of such contrariety. We should hardly expect the Bishop of Lincoln, for instance, and the Bishop of Liverpool, to coincide in their opinions; yet the utterances of each, when charging his clergy, would claim our serious attention, because each holds the office of a Bishop in the Church of God, and each from his position is able to focus the somewhat divergent lines of opinion which belong to his own particular school of thought.

The area over which an Episcopal Visitation should operate has usually been confined to the clergy and churchwardens; but the Bishop of Lichfield, following the earliest precedent, would extend its action to the laity generally. 'It is not,' says Bishop Maclagan, 'the clergy only—nor the churchwardens, these rulers of the congregation—but the whole body of the believers—"the brethren"—whom the Apostle desired to see.' The reference is to the words of S. Paul: 'Let us go again and visit our brethren in every city.' And then the Bishop adds: 'Is not this still the proper scope and character of every Episcopal Visitation?' This might have been possible in the infancy of the Christian Church among the sparse Christian population along the coasts of Asia Minor; but in a modern English diocese to 'visit' all 'the brethren' will certainly remain impracticable, until we have had a series of Bishoprics Bills. However, the Bishop of Lichfield touched as much life as he possibly could in his Primary Visitation, for he appointed 'twenty-two centres scattered over the length and breadth of his diocese,' whereat to meet and address his clergy. The 'addresses' of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol were also, we believe, delivered in different places, and were attended, not only by the clergy, but also by 'others of the Archdeaconry.'

The subject-matter of a charge may be but a few dry statistics, of value only or chiefly to those who live in the diocese, a brief *résumé* of Parliamentary measures, the repetition of some watchwords or shibboleths, and a peroration of hopes and fears; or, it may present a vivid picture of Church life in a large English diocese, as the Bishop of Lincoln does;

or it may deal with some fundamental truth, as the Bishop of Gloucester in his addresses 'On the Being of God'; or it may aim at being a deliverance, a manifesto upon most of the grave questions which, in respect of belief or practice, agitate the minds of Churchmen throughout the land; such is the charge of the Bishop of Lichfield. The recent Episcopal charges which we have selected for consideration may be in some degree regarded as representing different types of charges. We will deal with them *seriatim*.

The Bishop of Lincoln's charge, which is divided into ten addresses, was delivered during his Triennial Visitation in October last. At the outset he is occupied with the subject of Cathedral Reform. Having made reference to a code of laws and statutes which appertain to the See of Lincoln, he lays his finger on the cause of weakness in the Cathedral system, the 'prima mali labes,' namely, non-residence. But non-residence itself is in one respect a consequence as well as a cause; it is the result of Cathedral bodies having had very little to do. A stall was rather looked upon as a position of 'otium cum dignitate' than as the prelude to hard work; and the very cities which surround Cathedrals are still supposed to be infected with the inertia of the ecclesiastical body. The two suggestions which the Bishop of Lincoln (qualified to give advice, as he was himself a member of the Cathedral Commission a quarter of a century ago) would make to the Cathedral Commissioners would do much towards removing what remains of the old stigma of capitular inactivity. 1. Assign specific duties to every Dean and Canon Residentiary. 2. Require residence from them all. Bishop Wordsworth lays down as the *minimum* of residence eight months annually.

The Cathedral should be, what it has become in the metropolis, the centre of light and life to the diocese. And, therefore, we were glad to see that one of the subjects of the Church Congress for 1880 was 'The Cathedral System—how to reform it, so as to strengthen the relations of the cathedral to the diocese, and to make each cathedral a more efficient centre of religious activity.'

Dr. Wordsworth's idea of the relation of a Bishop to his clergy is evidently very different from that of Cardinal de Bonnechose. His clergy may be his 'regiment,' and may march when he says 'march'; but he feels, at any rate, bound to consult them before the order is given. 'Bishops,' he says, 'ought not to be autocrats, but should look to their presbyters for advice,' a maxim as old as 'the days of S. Ignatius.' It is common to hear fragmentary quotations from

S. Ignatius in support of the authority of the Bishop. Thus, 'Do nothing without the Bishop' is a hackneyed quotation in favour of the exclusive prerogative of the first order of clergy, whereas in almost every instance, where S. Ignatius commends the dignity of the Episcopal office, he is careful to connect with it 'the presbytery.' But the Bishop might have referred to an earlier and an inspired source for this principle, namely, to the Acts of the Apostles, to the account of the first council of the Church at Jerusalem, at which 'Apostles and elders came together' for consultation. It is evident, therefore, that not only in the second century, but also from the first, the idea of the Bishop acting independently, and taking no council with his 'Senatus,' was unknown. In an amusing note, the Bishop of Lincoln says: 'Episcopal individualism' is of 'modern growth.' Bishops used not to employ the pronoun '*I*,' but the plural '*we*,' and did not speak of '*my*' diocese, &c., but of '*our*' diocese. Perhaps some will think the old mode of speaking was only an instance of the 'plural of majesty.'

Dr. Wordsworth next directs his attention to the education of the clergy. He thinks that Cathedrals should revert to one of their original purposes, and become our chief means of maintaining sound learning among the clergy, when ancient colleges and universities no longer provide it. It is with no intention of superseding the old university training that the Bishop proposes that Cathedrals should henceforth supply Schools of Theology; for, without going the length of the Bishop of Worcester, who would find from an University staff of teachers 'an unrivalled opportunity for the acquisition of knowledge of Divine things,' he describes the benefit of University education as one 'greatly to be desired.' That the supply of graduates from the ancient universities is on the decline, may be gathered from the fact that three-fifths of those ordained during the ten years previous to Christmas 1877 were from Oxford and Cambridge; whilst at the Trinity Ordination in the last year there were only 53 per cent. of the candidates who had passed through the old curriculum. It is useless to laud the advantages of a college training, when for many reasons those who have the benefit of it turn their energies in other directions than that of 'the Church.' The question is, how in the existing state of things can the standard of literary and theological, yes, and spiritual, attainments, be kept at such a height, that the clergy may be well abreast of the intellectual currents of the age, as well as stored with the treasures of the past. The Bishop of Lincoln thinks that one important function of Cathedrals is to meet in

some measure this need ; and 'the Lincoln Theological College for the training of Candidates for Holy Orders' is the expression of this opinion in the concrete. The college was revived under the late Chancellor, now the Bishop of Truro, and about half of its students have been supplied from the two universities. Without being infected with what has been styled 'the Gentleman heresy,' we may yet express a hope that the training of theological colleges may not ultimately take the place of, but only supplement, the usual university course ; when a fairer system of Church patronage shall have been adopted, when vexatious litigations shall have ceased, and the present fears concerning the future of the Establishment shall have found their settlement, one way or the other. Whilst, with the Bishop, we deplore the change which has come over 'our ancient colleges and universities,' we must not forget that already in a Keble College, and we trust soon in a Selwyn College, we shall have foundations, the express purpose of which is to bring up the sons of English Churchmen in the faith of the Church of England, and also to provide, at a moderate cost, the 'training' needed for a well-educated clergy. We must strike a middle course between the narrowness of the Seminary system and the absence of any distinctive preparation for the priesthood. It certainly is, as the Bishop of Worcester says, 'a thing of great importance' that we should have 'continually a supply of men qualified to command influence and even respect from all sorts and conditions of men ;' but the question remains, *how are we to get them ?* Two thousand new churches were built between 1844 and 1874, but the annual average of clergy ordained between 1864 and 1873 was sixty-four below what it had been between 1844 and 1853. And, according to a system of averages reckoned by Mr. Armfield, there was a deficit of forty or fifty clergy last year, taking the increase of population at the rate of three hundred thousand per year. A deficit in quantity will surely in this case lead to a deterioration in quality in the long run ; it is, therefore, as it has been wisely said, time for those who are in charge of the ship, to inquire into the causes why it is getting undermanned.

After a glance at Continental Europe, a lament over the spread of sceptical opinions, and the tendency of Western Christendom towards 'deifying the Roman Papacy,' and a brief account of the Lambeth Conference, we come, in the Bishop of Lincoln's second address, upon the Burial Question. That Bishops are not prophets, at least, in the principal meaning of the word, is very evident from the remarks here

made upon Mr. Marten's Act. 'We may,' says Dr. Wordsworth, 'thankfully hail what appears to be a peaceful solution of a question which seemed to threaten the continuance of the Church as a national establishment.' He was not alone in this view of the effect of the Public Health (Interments) Act of 1879. But political dissent was anything but satisfied with this peaceful solution, and hence recent scenes in the Houses of Parliament. As we have already dealt with the Burials Act, we need not state again the just grounds of complaint which, as Churchmen, we have urged against a measure, which has been clamoured for only as a step towards a further invasion of the property of others. We cannot, however, pass by this subject without again commending the Bishop, whose charge we are engaged in reviewing, for the noble stand which he made in defence of the Church's rights. He was the mouthpiece of the opinions of at least 18,000 of the clergy, who affixed their signatures to a memorial against the principle of the new Act; and we are glad to hear that besides the 600 clergy of his own diocese, who have signed the address of thankfulness, the clergy generally have been allowed the opportunity of uniting with them in the expression of their hearty approval of their Bishop's conduct in the House of Lords. We knew, however, that all hope of resisting successfully the present measure was at an end, not only because the vote of Dissenters contributed such a large factor in the formation of the present majority in the Commons, but also on grounds which Lord Beaconsfield alluded to in language of thinly veiled satire in the House of Lords. All Churchmen could do, after recording their solemn protest against this 'unfair' measure, was to support with all their power the amendments of the Archbishop of York and of Lord Mount Edgumbe. The exclusion of places, where there are already unconsecrated grounds, or grounds of which portions are unconsecrated, from the operation of the Act; and its cessation, 'so soon as such unconsecrated burial-ground or cemetery has been provided,' would have very much modified its effects, although these restrictions did not touch its principle, which is, that every one has a civil right of interment in the churchyards, without being a member of the Church; and it is upon this false basis the Government Bill (and not only its predecessors) was drawn. We have already said, that whatever weight may attach to episcopal utterances, we cannot credit them with anything approaching to infallibility, as they labour under the defect of being contradictory. Now the Bishop of Worcester, though he cannot give up without a pang the 'old

VOL. XI.—NO. XXI.

O

churchyards, which surround our parish churches,' and would rather they should be 'kept to the use to which they have been hitherto devoted, the burial of the dead according to the rites of the Church of England,' yet expresses his wish for 'burial-places for the dead, *open to common use.*' What is meant by the words which we have italicized, if there is any need of explanation, may be gathered from the following statement: 'I confess that I have never consecrated part of a cemetery provided by a Burial Board without pain in observing the hard line of separation which divides the portion assigned to the use of members of the Church of England from that which is devoted to the burial of other persons.' We think the Bishop of Worcester is hardly consistent with the motto which he takes as his own, '*laudator temporis acti,*' when he gets upon the Burial Question. We remember how, about thirty-seven years ago, Bishop Phillpotts of Exeter was most careful to require a clear line of division between the unconsecrated ground and that which he was about to consecrate for the new cemetery in that city. Whilst the Bishop of Worcester is stationary or retrogressive in some matters, he praises 'the time to come' in others. It is rather difficult to gather from his Charge what are his precise views on Consecration. He speaks of 'the act of consecration' being 'the perpetual appropriation of the ground to the sacred purpose,' &c.; and then he adds: 'May we not rightly consider every particular grave in which the body of a departed friend is placed to be consecrated by the service which we use in burying it?' According to the first view it is consecrated ground before the funeral; according to the second, it becomes so afterwards. On the other hand, Dr. Wordsworth is certainly not chargeable with any obscurity as to the effect, either of Consecration or of the Burials Bill. He says, in writing in acknowledgment of the Address to which we have referred previously, 'this Burials Bill takes away God's things from Him'; 'this measure, if it becomes law, will be a national act of sacrilege.' By consecration 'our churchyards' . . . have been solemnly dedicated 'to the Blessed Trinity,' &c. It is usually held that the power of consecration resides in the Episcopal order, and, therefore, the act of burial, even though accompanied by the ministrations of a priest, cannot have the effect which is ascribed to it by the Bishop of Worcester. Without entering upon the results of Consecration, as given in the *Summa* of Aquinas, the first of which is '*quandam spiritualem virtutem per quam apta redduntur divino cultui,*' or occupying ourselves with the question whether churchyards may be rightly

said to be set apart by 'consecration' or 'benediction' (a distinction without a difference where unction is no part of the ceremonial in either case), we have all been accustomed to regard Consecration as imparting a certain sacredness to the ground as a permanent result, not simply dependent on our use, but on previous episcopal blessing; so that as we pass the lich-gate of a churchyard the associations of the place fill us with a reverent awe. This is no doubt an old-fashioned view of the matter, but we must ask to be allowed to prefer it to the modern one, which seems to be content with the legal bearings of the act of Consecration, and to ascribe to that act but little meaning or efficacy besides.

The next four Addresses of the Bishop of Lincoln are mainly taken up with Proceedings in Convocation, and deal with five topics, namely, 'The Athanasian Creed;' 'Burial Service,' especially in reference to unbaptized persons; 'The Ornaments Rubric;' 'The Draft Bill on Rites and Ceremonies;' and 'The Lectionary.'

With regard to the *Quicunque*, perhaps it would be impossible to find so calm and able a defence of the use of this Creed as the Bishop here provides in a dozen pages. He first quotes authorities for it, secondly gives the 'Synodical Declaration,' which the Convocation of Canterbury resolved should be appended to the Creed, and lastly answers objections. The authorities given are the Thirty-nine Articles, Richard Hooker, Dr. Waterland, and Richard Baxter, who says: 'I unfeignedly account the doctrine of the Trinity to be the sum and kernel of the Christian religion; and in the *Athanasian Creed* is the best exposition of it I ever read.'

As to the Synodical Declaration, we need only say that the deliberations of the two Provinces end in leaving the Creed and the prefixed rubric as they were. Dr. Wordsworth shows that many of the objections raised against the Athanasian Creed are of equal force against the Apostles' Creed. Thus the Athanasian Creed has no author, neither is the author of the Apostles' Creed known. The Athanasian Creed was never received by a General Council, nor was the Apostles'. The Athanasian Creed was not received in the public Liturgy by the Eastern Church; neither was the Apostles', &c. The absurd objection, that to receive another creed contravenes a decree of the Council of Ephesus, is at once confuted by reference to the words of the decree. The Council forbade the reception not of *ἄλλο σύμβολον*, but of *ἑτέραν πίστιν*. The Bishop reminds those who object to the use of the Creed on high festivals as unsuitable at such times, that it is a hymn as

well as a symbol of faith. 'It is not,' says Dr. Newman, 'a mere collection of notions, however momentous. It is a psalm or hymn of praise, of confession, of profound, self-prostrating homage, parallel to the canticles of the elect in the Apocalypse.' We believe the opposition to this Creed has been made to turn too much upon the doctrine of everlasting punishment; and, consequently, something deeper still has been comparatively lost sight of. The Creed is an abiding witness to the necessity of faith, and asserts that there are such sins as sins of unbelief. An age which regards sin only as it affects creatures—only in relation to opinion, life, property, social order and the like—cannot bring itself to accept the truth, that there are sins which are only against God. Unbelief is not regarded as *moral* evil, because to believe is considered to depend upon the conformation of the brain, external circumstances, &c.; not on an act of the will, under the influence of Divine grace. Faith is identified with mere opinion; and, therefore, to believe or not to believe in any doctrine cannot be a matter of such immense importance. The Athanasian Creed is hated, not only because it points to the eternal consequences of sin, but also because it makes unbelief a sin at all. Herein lies the explanation of the late Mr. Brewer's assertion: 'There is no safe ground between infidelity and the Athanasian Creed.'

In condemning the suggestion that the damnatory clauses should be expunged, the Bishop of Lincoln incidentally delivers a very important testimony as to the limits by which a National Church is restricted in dealing with formularies: 'It is not competent for any particular Church, such as the Church of England, to tamper with ancient formularies which are not her property, but belong to the whole Church of Christ.' The Bishop of Lichfield makes a similar remark. The principle here laid down is a vital one. There are certain limits as to dealing with Church questions, whether they affect ceremonial actions or doctrines, which the 'quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus' assign, not only to a National Church, but to the whole Church. Even the infallibility of the Pope is to some degree, Roman Catholics admit, 'tied up.' He is, according to the Pastoral of the Swiss Bishops, 'limited' in its exercise by the creeds already in existence, by preceding definitions of the Church, by the Divine law, by the constitution of the Church, &c. There is in some quarters a distrust of the actions of our Convocations, arising upon a fear (which may indeed be, and we trust is, baseless) that Convocation, in its exercise of the power with which it is entrusted, will feel itself less 'tied up' than the Pontiff himself.

If the counsels of the Bishop of Lincoln are followed, we are assured that ancient precedent, Catholic custom, and universal consent, will have their due weight in the deliberations of that body to which Churchmen rightly look for guidance.

We cannot altogether commend the utterances of the Bishop of Lichfield upon the subject of the Athanasian Creed and 'The Eternal Future.' Upon this, and other grave questions, he delivers his mind; though, perhaps, it would have been wiser to have waited until a longer experience in the Episcopal office and deeper theological attainments should have added their value to his opinions. His kindness of disposition is evident; his piety and devotion breathe in every page of his charge: but there is a feebleness of grasp and a too great subjectivity in dealing with profound doctrines. With regard to eternity of punishment, and 'Universalism,' he says of the latter, or of something closely akin to it,

'If we are asked, whether it may be possible that such a happy issue may be in store for mankind as that suggested by the naturally attractive theory of which I have spoken, we can only answer, that with an infinite God, and one whose name is love, all things are possible that the human heart can either desire or conceive. Nor need we condemn nor repel those who, prompted by the tenderness of a loving spirit, are led to "faintly trust the larger hope."'

We are aware that the Bishop has since repudiated any tendency in himself to accept 'the naturally attractive theory.' But a Bishop has to do more than aver his own orthodoxy: he has 'to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word.' And in Bishop Maclagan we expected firmer lines of eschatological teaching. The Athanasian Creed cannot now be given up on the ground of its unsuitableness to be repeated by mixed congregations. Its abandonment can only be brought about by the discovery that it teaches something *untrue*, and holds up before mankind a delusive terror. 'Men,' it has been said, 'die of all diseases; creeds, of *only one*—that of being found out.'

On the *Burial of the Dead*, which is considered in the Bishop of Lincoln's fourth address, we have only two comments to make, in addition to what has already been said on 'The Burials Bill.' We were rather surprised to find the Bishop speaking not unfavourably of some service to be said over the unbaptized. We fear the effect would be to lessen the feeling of necessity for the Sacrament of Baptism. It may betray a very low state of religious belief, yet it is nevertheless true, that the object of securing the recitation of

the Burial Service over the dying child often impels the parent to run for the priest, when the spiritual privileges bestowed by the Sacrament would not be a sufficient motive for hastening its administration. Moreover, a service of 'prayers taken from the Book of Common Prayer and portions of Holy Scripture,' and 'approved by the Ordinary,' when used over the unbaptized, must tend to obscure the line of demarcation between the realm of nature and that of grace. The argument, that in large towns, where there are vast populations with but a very few clergy, numbers of children will be found who have not been baptized, and that not through the fault of parents, but because 'the labourers are few;' and that it is hard to deprive such children of some form of burial, is one which seems to us to be of little force. We believe the country would be more affected by a provision such as is proposed than large towns. And for this reason; in large towns, there are cemeteries close at hand, where those who are interred are unknown to the officiating minister, who asks only for the 'Burial Extract' before he proceeds with the service. Doubtless, multitudes are married and buried by the Church in our great cities, who have never received the Baptismal gift. In the country, where every one is known, the provision, if a desirable one, would prove a greater boon. The other point we would notice, clearly connected with the foregoing, is the Bishop of Lincoln's remarks on lay-baptism. Numbers die unbaptized, because, though our people in other respects may not have such a high notion of priestly power as is entertained elsewhere, they think no one, whatever be the extreme necessity of the case, can baptize but a clergyman. It has ever been held that all that is required for valid administration of Baptism in cases of necessity is that it be done in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and water poured upon the child at the same time. Bishop Wordsworth gives some Church of England authorities, and the decision of the Upper House of Convocation in 1712, as to the efficacy of Baptism when received with due matter and form. He simply states that lay-baptism was allowed in the Ancient Church. The passages which are commonly adduced in favour of this practice are such as these. Tertullian (*de Baptismo*, c. 17): 'laicus reus erit perditionis hominis,' if he neglects this duty. S. Jerome: 'Baptizare, si tamen necessitas cogit, scimus etiam licere laicis.' Both Lutherans and Roman Catholics admit the validity of lay-baptism: the latter, as usual, are very explicit. 'Baptism can be licitly and validly administered by male or female,

infidel and heretic.' There is no fear of the last-named concerning themselves about the baptism of infants, save to prevent it. And we need not therefore enter upon the difficult question which arose between Stephen and the upholders of re-baptism in the third century. The practical bearings of the subject of lay-baptism cannot be exaggerated, when we consider the increasing difficulty of finding clergy for our large towns, and the perils of birth; it would seem to be a primary duty that doctors and nurses should be made acquainted with what can be done in cases of emergency.

The next Address of the Bishop of Lincoln, which is upon the 'Ornaments Rubric,' has attracted considerable attention, a portion of the argument having been reprinted for general circulation, and published by Messrs. Parker. The Bishop's views, if we mistake not, have undergone some change as to the authority for vestments. He regards the Ornaments Rubric as the 'battle-field of two contending parties,' and it is evident which he thinks has most right on its side. In the one camp he places those who would enforce the literal interpretation of the Rubric, and therefore make the Edwardian vestments obligatory. In the other camp he disposes of those who accept the recent decisions of the Final Court of Appeal. The Bishop evidently feels the force of Mr. Parker's 'learned researches' into those 'recent decisions,' or, rather, into the mistaken grounds on which they were based, too strongly to adventure himself into the ranks of those who are satisfied with the Ridsdale judgment. He seems even to give a slight hope that it 'may be set aside by future judicial determinations,' though he advises obedience to its decisions as the best policy. There is a feeling which many share respecting the Ridsdale judgment who have never worn a vestment, and who care little for what is called Ritualism, to which no one has given better expression than Mr. Hubbard, who, in a paper read before the Oxford Diocesan Conference, said, 'the decisions of the Judicial Committee' have 'failed to obtain acquiescence, because they bore the appearance of being determined by the consideration of what would satisfy the requirements, not of the *Law*, but of *public opinion*. Any one who has followed the controversy provoked by the Ridsdale judgment must feel deeply distressed at the position in which that judgment is left by the calm, searching, and convincing pamphlet letter of Mr. James Parker.'¹ However, the Bishop

¹ Paper read in 1878 before Oxford Diocesan Conference by the Right Hon. J. G. Hubbard, M.P. London: Vacher and Sons, 1878.

neither enters the Ritualistic nor the anti-Ritualistic camp, though his face is towards the former. He avoids Scylla and Charybdis, and takes the middle line, that the Edwardian vestments are legal but not obligatory. We have not space to follow the Bishop's argument on this matter. He thinks the vestments *were* obligatory, and that some change in the law took place between 1640 and 1690, whereby they became only *permissible*; and that this change may be traced in the wording of the Rubric. Thus, the 'Ornaments Rubric,' as it stood in the Prayer-Book of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I., was imperative as to the use of vestments—'*The Minister, at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministrations, shall use such ornaments in the Church, &c.*': whereas in 1662 the words became *general, passive, and permissive*—'*Such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof shall be retained and be in use.*' We are not so convinced as the Bishop that this change of expression is evidence of a change in the law; as the injunctions of the Rubrics from first to last are bound up with and regulated by the same Act of Parliament. It might have been, as he suggests, 'a wise and conciliatory condescension to the scruples of Presbyterians and others;' but, if so, they must have been satisfied with a change of words, which at any rate did not much affect the substance of the Rubric. The conclusion of the Bishop of Lincoln seems very equitable and agreeable to sound sense, and useful for the time being:—

'A charitable consideration is due to the opinions of a large number of the clergy and laity, who, while they think that no vestment ought to be *required* of any clergyman but a surplice, are of opinion that the vestments ought not to be prohibited; at the same time that they readily allow that the vestments ought not to be introduced by any minister except under careful control, and with the goodwill of the flock.'

The way out of present difficulties on Ritual, according to the Bishop of Lichfield, is to resort to the Bishop, and abide by his decision. Yet this, were it done, would hardly prevent diversity of use. The diversity between parish and parish would be exchanged for that between diocese and diocese. Moreover, when Dr. Maclagan quotes the Prayer-Book Preface, that those who 'doubt' or 'diversely take' anything 'concerning the service of the Church' should 'always resort to the Bishop of the Diocese,' and then abide by his order, he does not add what follows, 'so that the same order be not contrary to anything contained in this book.' In this proviso lies the point in question. The settlement of such a funda-

mental question as the meaning of the Ornaments Rubric cannot appertain to any individual Bishop, but is a matter of national interest. The Bishop has to administer the law of the Church, and not to adapt it in order to meet any special set of circumstances. We must look to the Church of England in her Provincial Synods, acting in a constitutional manner, for the final settlement of questions which affect the whole Church; but yet acting within those limits by which the Synods of a National Church should be restricted. We must not give those 'who seem determined at all hazards to defy all authority of Bishop, Court or Crown, and to accept no judgment but their own,' the possibility of replying to this charge in the words of Sir Thomas More, who, when thus addressed by the Abbot of Westminster, 'You ought, sir, to think your own conscience erroneous, when you have against you the whole council of the nation,' retorted, 'I should, if I had not for me a still greater council, the whole council of Christendom.'

The next important matter in the Bishop of Lincoln's Addresses is his reference to the Draft of a Bill framed *to provide facilities for the amendment from time to time of the rites and ceremonies of the Church*, which was accepted by the Convocations of both Provinces. The views on this subject of the Bishop of Lincoln and of the Bishop of Worcester are diametrically opposed to one another. Dr. Wordsworth inserts the Bill in detail, and then adds, 'the wisdom of the action of Convocation in this matter will be generally recognized by the clergy and laity of the Church.' Dr. Philpott says, 'I cannot help expressing my alarm at the prospect of any such measure being adopted. If I could think it possible that the sanction of the Legislature should be given to it, I should be distressed for the future of the Church of England.' And then the Bishop of Worcester gives some reasons for this grave assertion. He thinks Convocation hardly qualified, as now constituted, to deal with the matters which would be brought before it; that the laity should be consulted; and that this Bill would throw open the door to agitation, and give 'occasion to perpetual controversy.' There may be some truth in the Bishop's dark forebodings, and to facilitate changes is undesirable; but has he anything better to propose as a mode of dealing with existing difficulties?

The next twenty pages of the Bishop of Lincoln's Charge are taken up with 'the Lectionary.' He proposes, as is well known, a revision of the *Table of Lessons* of 1871, and gives his reasons, marking defects in the present Lectionary, and

sustaining his complaints by interesting examples, in the lessons from the books of Genesis, Job, Proverbs, &c.

Amongst so much that is of importance, it is difficult to make a selection, but there is only one address more to which we can extend our comments, that is, the seventh, which is on *Marriage with a deceased Wife's Sister*. A clergyman had written to the Bishop asking him whether he should administer the Holy Communion to one who had married his deceased wife's sister, and the reply was in the negative. In this address he gives the reasons for that decision. The Ordination Vow 'to minister the doctrine, and sacraments, and discipline of Christ, as the Church and realm have received the same,' is the first ground on which he bases a clergyman's duty to refuse communion to those who have contracted such a marriage. For the doctrine of the Church, he of course points to Canon xcix., which refers to the Table of Degrees. But the whole argument of the Bishop of Lincoln rests on the Divine Law. He regards Chapter xviii. of Leviticus as conclusive on the point. The law he says was not only for the Israelites, as some object, but for all; and the whole question is to be judged from the standpoint, that man and wife are *one blood*. He then refers to Christian antiquity, and, *more suo*, charges the Church of Rome with departing from it, by granting dispensations to allow such marriages, thus 'having been tempted by the lust of lucre and of power to swerve from the rule of her fathers.' He then glances at the social consequences of repealing the law. We think, since the time when this address was delivered, we may congratulate those who regard marriage as something more than a civil contract on the successful meeting at S. James's Hall, and on the rejection of the bill, the second reading of which Lord Houghton proposed in the House of Lords. The majority of eleven against the bill, we are thankful to say, was brought about by the votes of the Bishops. Sir Thomas Chambers will doubtless lose no time in pressing his motion in the House of Commons—'that in the opinion of the House, it is expedient that, at the earliest moment, marriage with a deceased wife's sister should be made legal.' What then are the clergy to do if this incestuous form of marriage should be legalized? We cannot do better than answer this question in the Bishop of Lincoln's words: 'If the Civil Power should legalize such marriage by its authority, would he (*i.e.* the Parish Priest) not be charged with disloyalty to his Sovereign, and to the government of his country, if he refuse to do so? He would be placed in a painful

dilemma ; but his course is plain. He must obey God rather than men.' And the paragraph concludes with these notable words : ' It will be an evil day for England when the Civil Power engages in a conflict with the Church of God, and proclaims war against the ministers of God.' We do not for one moment suppose that the House of Commons will throw out Sir T. Chambers's Bill as that House is at present constituted, though the 'earliest moment' for its introduction has not yet come. But we trust that some plan will be devised, whereby the consciences of the clergy may be protected ; and that such marriages, as they will be rendered valid only by the law of man, may not be able to command the Rites of the Church.

We must now turn to the six Addresses delivered by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Their subject-matter is very different from that which has hitherto occupied our attention. Bishop Ellicott has chosen the highest of all themes for consideration, 'the Being of God.' He apologizes to his audience for bringing forward what might seem 'to be a strange subject for a Christian, and especially a Christian minister,' to descant upon. Recent events, however, have, if such were necessary, more than justified his choice. The fact that a constituency has been found to select an atheist for their representative in the House of Commons will give to his pages an additional interest and value. When belief in a Supreme Being is considered of less importance than political bias, it is time to consider whither we are drifting.

The first Address is introductory, and simply 'marks out the ground,' suggesting the stand-point from which the subject is to be regarded. The lines of thought are not merely to be severally tested, but, like so many threads woven together, are to form a cumulative argument. The threads themselves will be of different texture and fibre, and each one will be in advance of its predecessor in potency, thus giving what the Bishop aptly calls an *ascensive* nature to the proofs which he adduces.

There are four grounds, apart from Revelation, for believing in the existence of God, namely, 'the general consent of mankind,' 'the existence of the universe,' 'the presence of final ends in nature,' and 'the moral law.' The argument from 'Consciousness' is not dealt with, nor that of the necessary relation of our moral measurements to an Absolute and Infinite Standard of Perfection, as dealt with by Aquinas. The Bishop, we may notice, evidently inclines to the doctrine, though without adopting it, that the soul has *innatas cogni-*

tiones,—some innate perception of the truth of the existence of a Divine Being. We hardly, however, agree with his conclusion, that 'these proofs of the existence of God would never have been drawn out by so many of the clearest and most powerful intellects, if there had not been in all those minds that innermost conviction that God is.' It seems to us that these endeavours to prove the existence of a Divine Being can hardly amount to an evidence of the presence of any clear and universal intuition. We readily admit that it is more fitting, and, we would add, reverent, to speak of 'considerations' than of 'proofs' or 'arguments' when treating of the existence of God; and to set before us the task of formulating, rather than originating, 'the idea of God in the human mind.'

The first argument is drawn from the general consent of mankind. In this respect the Bishop pursues a different order from that of Barrow, who proves the Being of God from 'the framework of the world,' and then from 'universal consent.' But the arrangement is arbitrary; it may be a reflex of the relative potency of the different grounds of evidence to the writer's own convictions. We think, nevertheless, the steps of progression would be more regular if Barrow's order of commencement had been followed. We should thus ascend from material to mental, from mental to moral, and from moral to spiritual, regions of inquiry. The argument from 'universal consent' is supposed to be damaged in the estimate of the present day by a wider and more trustworthy research into the opinions of remote and barbarous tribes, as well as by a juster appreciation of atheistic Buddhism. Men may sink so low as to lose all the higher instincts of their nature; yet the absence of all religion amongst such is really no more an argument against 'general consent' than the existence of men who have lost their limbs may be made a ground of evidence against the fact that the human body is as a rule provided with arms and legs. Some, again, have endeavoured to weaken the argument from universal consent by depreciating the religious opinions of primitive times, because man's mental powers were not then developed, and therefore his religious notions were of little worth. Dr. Newman, be it observed, in his *Grammar of Assent*, reverses the picture, and regards man's ideas about religion as more likely to be trustworthy in his initial than in his final state; the former being natural, the latter artificial; since civilization has developed some elements of his being, *e.g.* his intellect, to the expense of others, *e.g.* his conscience.

Of the four ways of accounting for this general belief in God, namely, instinct, tendency, deduction, tradition, the Bishop seems disinclined to make a selection, for which we commend his prudence. He does not, however, leave the 'insoluble problem' without dealing Mill a side-long blow for choosing the third, and thus attributing to barbarous tribes a logical process of which they were extremely unlikely to be capable.

The proofs of God's existence, which may be derived from the contemplation of the universe, are considered in the third and fourth Addresses. The fact that the universe exists attests the existence of a Creator, and the tendency of science to unify the forces of the universe only strengthens the presumption of the Oneness of the Being from which it emanated. In reply to the objection, that efficient causes are to be excluded from our conception of causation, Dr. Ellicott makes the telling remark, 'We are to limit ourselves to the conception of causation, without importing into it that which would seem to be its very essential idea—efficiency.' But although the existence of God may be demonstrable *à posteriori* 'per creaturas,' or possibly *à simultaneo* from the idea of a necessary and Primal Ens; yet the act of creation itself is something unthinkable. The action of the human will supplies but a faint analogy to the creative act of God, and, as a principle of origination, is itself incomprehensible. After all, it is by *faith* we understand that the worlds were made. Creation is a mystery. Reason may point to its necessity; but it cannot form a conception of the first emergence of primordial matter.

The argument from design is next insisted on. In nature, the Bishop finds order, law, harmony, progress, adaptation, and finality. The fact that all things have emerged from far fewer types and simpler elements than was once supposed makes, as is well said, the transit from the Architect to the Creator more easy. As we go back from the complicated to the simpler, from the organized to the elementary, we gradually, as it were, approach the brink of creation, and thus find that 'the Designer of all things, and He who caused all things to be,' are one and the same Person. The Bishop is on the whole less clear in stating the objections to the arguments, than the arguments themselves. The three leading objections to the argument from design are well stated and answered in Maitland's *Steps to Faith*. The chief objection arises from the fact that the argument itself used to be strained. It is only presumptive, not demonstrative. It points in a

certain direction, whither you may look for an explanation of the wonderful adaptation of nature. The Address on 'the Being of God as evinced by the moral law' is to our mind the least strong in the series. Perhaps, the reason is that arguments are not at home in that region. 'Conscience,' says the Archbishop of York very finely, 'is not a demonstration of God; it is something better and higher—a way to God.'

The final chapter is devoted to a consideration of objections, and of the 'evolutionary hypothesis' regarded as a 'theory which, it is contended, renders, from a scientific point of view, the existence of God, considered as a cause of things, superfluous and unnecessary.' It seems perfectly monstrous that such an application should be made of the evolutionary theory; and we heartily share the author's sentiments when he says (p. 156) that 'the more evolution is pressed upon us as the fundamental and persistent process of nature, the more urgently will the hypothesis be needed of an originally initiating and directive First Cause.' This is followed up by a criticism of the hypothesis of natural selection as being incompetent to account for the forms of life evolved in a limited time on the earth. It should not be forgotten that *this*, as a means of accounting for evolution, not evolution itself, is the Darwinian hypothesis. Bishop Ellicott's power seems to us to lie rather in abstract thought and logical suggestiveness, than in clearness of definition and aptness of illustration. These would have aided us, and brightened our path, as we traced the converging lines of evidence which lead us to the threshold of Revelation, and point unmistakably to the steps of a Throne, and to One Who sitteth thereon.

ART. XI.—EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT.

1. *Everlasting Punishment.* Lectures at S. James's, Piccadilly. By E. M. GOULBURN, D.D., Dean of Norwich. (London, 1880.)
2. *What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?* In reply to Dr. Farrar. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D. (London, 1880.)

BY the overruling guidance of the Divine Spirit which indwells and informs her, the Church of God has, at different periods of her eventful history, directed her conscious thought

now on this, now on that, portion of the Deposit of the Faith committed to her keeping, now on this, now on that, portion of the great Revelation of Moral and Religious and Theological Truth, of which she is the appointed Witness and Guardian. The external exciting cause of these special movements of thought has mostly been the rise of heretical speculations, which forced controversy upon her, and compelled her to the express formulation, in carefully selected language, of the truth which she has always held, though not always, it may be, with equally clear intellectual consciousness, nor with that realized sharpness of outline which arises from its close contrast with error. At such pregnant epochs her Almighty Head has usually raised up some one or more Saints of commanding intellect, of clear spiritual insight, and of earnest tenacity of purpose, who have been her leaders and champions in the defence and confirmation of the Faith, and the chief guides, under the influence of God's Holy Spirit, in framing those clear statements of important doctrines which are the priceless treasure of all succeeding generations of Christians. The palmary example of this is of course the controversy as to the Person of Christ, of which S. Athanasius was the centre. In a less degree the same may, perhaps, be said of that on the relation of Divine Grace to the Free-Will of man, in which S. Augustine took so large a part. But there is a clear difference between these two cases, in that the latter did not contribute any fresh clauses to the generally accepted Creeds of the Church, and was altogether more local, affecting only the Western half of Christendom, either at the time or afterwards.

This narrower, more merely local, this purely Western and Latin, character has marked with a certain insufficiency the results then arrived at on the exceedingly difficult problems, the discussion of which was brought on by the questionable teaching of Pelagius and Cælestius and their supporters. Much was left unsettled of the deep questions, as much philosophical as religious, then raised. What was settled—and that may perhaps be best summed up in a stanza of the lovely rhythm of good King Robert,

Sine Tuo Numine
Nihil est in homine,
Nihil est innoxium,—

the great practical truth, namely, that without the ever-acting power of the Spirit of God upon him, man is morally and spiritually helpless and lifeless: this was indeed most

precious and most vital. But when speculation ran up into the mysteries of God's Eternal Predestination and Fore-Knowledge and their relation to the Free-Will of man, and a turn was given to it which was more philosophical than Scriptural, and the argument was grounded more on Reason than on Revelation, the benefit was more doubtful. Looking at it from our point of view, centuries later, when we can estimate more justly the evil effects of the superstructure which Calvin, and those who further developed his teaching, raised upon the foundation originally laid by S. Augustine, we are not sure that we are not justified in saying that the mischief done is certain. Compared with the East, Western Christendom was, in its early centuries, unlearned. It could furnish but few minds capable of dealing with such subjects. The intellect of Augustine consequently dominated and controlled Western theological thought, then and afterwards, too exclusively. The Church may never with safety 'call any man her master upon earth.' That, with its resulting party names and narrow denominationalism, is the special characteristic of Schism, at once its parent and its offspring. Of this faultiness and deficiency of treatment of the grave topics of God's dealings with the soul of man and man's response thereto, we, in these days, are reaping the results. There are evident signs of fresh movement on this whole class of questions. By strong reaction from the horrifying excesses of Calvinism; by the earnest questionings of thoughtful minds, such especially as have been brought up under the influence of narrow and imperfect forms of Christianity, as to the enigma of Life, past, present, and future; by the erratic ventures of Free Thought in every possible direction; grave and anxious difficulties, as to points which are felt intimately and vitally to concern every human being, and which touch fundamentally the moral evidence of Christianity and even of Theism, have been brought into open daylight, and demand an answer: or, if that may not be, at least the tenderest consideration.

What was God's design in the creation of intelligent beings, angels or men? Are they inherently, or only conditionally and possibly, immortal? How did evil get in amongst them? Is it possible that all may be saved? Is it possible that any may be lost? If God foresaw the loss of any, as we must suppose He did, why did He create them? How long does their probation last? Is it continued after death? When is the great issue settled in individual cases? If adversely, is the ensuing doom for ever and without hope?

We believe we have put the most important question first; that (we mean) whose answer will rule our conceptions of those that follow, and of the answers to them. And to our first question Dean Goulburn supplies a thoughtful answer in the fourth, by far the most important of the series, of his *S. James's Sermons* of the present year:—

'Are we to suppose' (he asks, p. 92) 'that God called creatures into existence merely as a sphere for His benevolence, and that the happiness of these creatures was the main end of the creation—the end in which God acquiesces, and beyond which He has no other?'

He points out that, on this hypothesis,

'it is impossible to believe that any creatures will be permitted to suffer everlastingly; we are driven to suppose either that, after the infliction of a certain amount of punishment, impenitent sinners will be restored and brought back to God's favour, or that He will, in the exercise of His Divine power, annihilate them, and so cause their sufferings to cease. This view imperatively demands that, in the furthest point of sight to which the mind's eye can reach, there shall be none but rejoicing and happy creatures around the throne of God.'

But to the question 'Will this account of the matter . . . stand the test of facts and of Revelation?' he says, 'I answer unhesitatingly, No.' And he proceeds to show that God must have had 'some other object distinct from and beyond that of the happiness of His creatures, such, for example, as the manifestation of that awful justice, purity, and holiness, which, no less than love, is a part of His character;' that He made all things 'for the manifestation of His own glorious attributes;' that His own Glory is 'the ultimate end' of all His actions, and so must be of ours, as it was of Christ's; that, in thus making Himself the centre of all things, alike to Himself and to all His creatures, and His 'self-manifestation' the great end of all that is, 'the great Creator, who has an independent and underived existence,' acts at once according to the absolute rights, and to the inherent and essential 'necessity, of His nature.'

We believe that this is so. Nay more, we believe that it is a thought that needs especially to be brought into prominence in the present day. It is instructive to note how minds of the calibre of Butler and Mozley have seen and have insisted on the solemn truth that the character of God is not one merely of irrespective benevolence, but that His holiness and His justice are as truly parts of it as His love and mercy. We say 'parts of it,' according to the language we must use, though the truth perhaps may be that His attributes,

though distinct (as one may say) externally, *i.e.* relatively to the occasions and subjects upon which they are manifested to the apprehension of the creature, are in themselves identical, *i.e.* are all Love, which 'God is.' We mean that possibly the truth may be that God, being always in Himself the same, is to each creature just that which itself, especially its own moral and spiritual condition, permits or compels (for we may perhaps express it equally truly either way) Him to be; and that in every case, without exception, such moral and spiritual condition, as fixed in quality (though not, of course, in degree), when probation is over, is the total and abiding result of the action of the individual Will, in its own personal relation throughout the period of probation, to God's offers, and drawings, and grace, and is a result for which the individual will is solely and completely responsible by virtue of that irrevocable gift, that inalienable prerogative, of liberty of choice, which is an essential part of God's Image in man, and which, therefore, He Himself cannot force, *i.e.* annihilate, though He can confine its operation to its own individual sphere and to its consequences within that range.

If it be asked, Why then did God give this awful power of Free-Will, through which, wrongly exercised, as He foresaw it would be, evil has entered into the world of angels and of men? we answer, So only were morality and the love of God possible. God longed, as a means towards the great inclusive end of His own Happiness and Glory in His own Self-Evolution and Self-Manifestation, for the answering love of creatures morally like Himself. In creatures without Free-Will, *i.e.* in whom either was no Will at all, or the Will was absolutely, *i.e.* mechanically, overruled by external pressure on the part of God, neither morality nor love could really exist. The desired and necessary end could be attained in no other way. The awful risk must be faced, or there could be no result at all. Without Free-Will and its risk there had been no creation of moral and spiritual beings possible; nothing beyond material nature, with its uniform blind submission to external law; or possibly (the thought is barely conceivable) only beings with merely intellectual and reasoning powers, memory, and thought, and calculation, seated in, or working through, a highly organized material brain, but with no will, no conscience, no moral nature, no capacity of loving or being loved, no character, no individuality, no real self. But all this had been, even on the grandest conceivable scale of force and of extent, no worthy or adequate manifestation of God, Who 'is Love.' All this could have yielded

no satisfaction to His supreme desire and claim and right of adoration and of love, nor yielded any point of contact whereat a union of the Creator with the creature, such as the Incarnation is, had been possible. If then, it may next be asked, moral life and capacity of loving God in creatures were impossible without Free-Will, and Free-Will could not be without the possible risk of misuse, and God foresaw that that risk would be actualized in the case, if it were but of one only among the myriads of His intelligent and moral creatures, that there would be if it were but one of whom it should be said, It were good for him that he had never existed, why did not God's mercy and love forbid creation altogether? To this query, as we have said, we think Dean Goulburn's sermon, *Everlasting Punishment not Inconsistent with God's Purpose in Creation*, supplies a sufficient answer; and that without entering, by way of further easing of the difficulty, on any comparison or balance between the sum total of the unspeakable happiness of those creatures who shall attain the end of their being, and the misery of those, however many or few, who miss it by their own fault, and so glorify God only in being monuments of His awful justice and holiness.

We say it is well that this aspect of truth should be brought forward in these days, because we think there has been on all sides, orthodox as well as unorthodox, too great a tendency towards an *exclusive* dwelling on the Loving and Fatherly character of God. This has been doubtless one of the results of the reaction from Calvinism. But there is grave moral and spiritual danger in forgetting the correlative truths, of the awful Majesty of God as the All-Holy, 'of purer eyes than to behold iniquity' and 'that will by no means clear the guilty;' and of His supreme rights and claims, as sovereign Lord and Master by right of Creation, on the conscience of the creature for absolute self-surrendering obedience and submission, active and passive, to His Will, when that Will is with sufficient clearness ascertained.

We think, then, that if such primary principles be admitted to lie at the very foundation of the general subject of God's dealings with mankind, then the difficulties raised as to the existence of evil and suffering in the Creation; or as to punishment, present or future; or the nature and duration of the latter—all which are subordinate parts of the general subject—are in a way to be accounted for, and (we think) in the estimate of thoughtful minds, to be removed. For, as to the administration of such primary principles, we can have no hesitation in trusting absolutely

either the infinite and absolute Justice and Love of God as equally operative in every case, or that perfect heart-searching knowledge which He alone does or can possess of the inward history, with all its temptations and ignorance, or with all its knowledge and opportunities, of each several soul, which enables Him with unerring accuracy to know both when probation is over, and further moral change (*i.e.* of quality) impossible; and what is the exact position, on this or that side, for or against God, of the great dividing line of judgment (*κρίσις*, separation); what the exact degree of its nearness to Him, and further capacity of growth towards and in Him, if on the right hand; what the exact degree of alienation from Him and of consequent loss, if on the left. All this we can safely leave to Him, sure that 'the Judge of all the earth' will 'do right,' and remembering (1) that mystery, impenetrable mystery, must ever necessarily attend, *for us*, the Being and the doings of God; and (2) that we now, at any rate, see so small a part of His doings, especially of their ultimate issues, that what to our limited sight may seem a straight line may be really a portion of an almost infinite curve.

But of the restriction of probation to the present life, the calling in question of which is, perhaps, the worst and most dangerous feature of Dr. Farrar's shallow, excited and self-contradictory book, *Eternal Hope*, or of the endlessness of the condition finally adjudged at its close, we cannot, looking at once at Revelation and at life, permit ourselves to doubt.

On this practically most important point Dr. Pusey says (p. 17):—

'A further probation after this life is clearly a mere human imagination. "Universalism" itself does not require it. It is only a human theory, devised to make "universalism" plausible. A continuation of the discipline of the soul, a preparation for the Beatific Vision, a development of faculties as yet undeveloped here, continued influences from God maturing the soul, a purifying it from the stains of sin—of this or the like there is no question.'

Even a heathen moralist like Plato—as Dr. Pusey (p. 4) shows by a quotation from the *Gorgias*, and the same might abundantly be shown of Aristotle—studying the observable facts of human nature, could see clearly enough that habitual misuse of moral choice, in lifelong sin against light and conscience and acknowledged moral law, lands men in an incurable and incorrigible, and so hopeless, state, for which nothing remains but its inevitable attendant of hopeless misery and loss in standing alienation from good. The condition of

those who sin against the greater light and grace of the Gospel must necessarily be worse. It is childish to argue, as some do, that an eternity of punishment is an unjust penalty for sins committed in time, in a longer or shorter space of earthly life. For this rests on an inadequate and wholly mistaken estimate of what sin is—on a forgetfulness that it is a question of *quality* and not of *quantity* or duration or time taken in committing. The essence of sin lies, not in the external act done, but in the amount of consciousness, of wilfulness, of defiance of the known Law and Will of God, on the part of the inward will. The outward act may be slight, or, however serious, may be short; but its effects remain, in the altered set of the will and the abiding pollution of the soul (until it is cast out by real repentance bringing the will back again to God), and in the (it may be) irreparable moral injury done to others, as well as the dishonour to God. A woman's adultery is but a single brief act; but it alters for ever and irrecoverably her whole, both inward and outward, relation to her husband.¹ So with the soul and God. Sin is the contradictory of God. Its end and aim is the annihilation of God. Its essence lies, when its tendencies are perfected, in defiant hatred of God, seated in the will of the sinner, *i.e.* in the centre of his *self*: that is to say, it would, when 'finished,' dethrone God and deify Self in His place; thus 'bringing forth death,' *i.e.* absolute cutting-off from God, with whom alone 'is the well of Life.' So long as this is so, God *must*, by the very law of His Being, by the bare fact of His existence, condemn the sinner and the sin. And this, as all the other moral and inward consequences of sin, is not an arbitrarily imposed penalty which might conceivably not have been, or been other, but is a necessary consequence, wrapped up in the very nature of sin as sin. That repentance, *i.e.* change of will, is always possible, after whatever persistence in wilful sin, cannot (we think) be seriously maintained on either Scriptural or natural grounds. We believe, with Aristotle, that the will may be so broken down as to become helplessly fixed in evil, and the moral

¹ On these grounds we should doubt the accuracy of Dr. Goulburn's language in his note on p. 15:—'Even the aggregate sin of the whole human race is *finite*: it has its limits.' Any sin is an infinite evil, does infinite dishonour to God. We cannot talk of sin being *finite*, having limits, as if it were a measurable quantity of something material. It is as if one should talk of *finite poison*, *i.e.* poison which only affected that part of the body with which it was in actual contact (like a blister on the surface), whereas its tendency, and if not arrested its result, is to annihilate the life of the whole.

perception so extinguished that men may come to see no beauty in goodness that they should desire it.

Nor does Holy Scripture warrant us in expecting that God may in such cases, be they many or few, violate His uniform moral order and work a miracle in the forcible turning back of the alienated will towards Himself after the discipline of life has failed. We may even say that *He could not do so*; because it would be the denial of the Free-Will which Himself has given.

'God,' says Dr. Pusey (p. 31) 'willeth that we should be saved. But He willeth not to do violence to our will, which He holds sacred, as the finite image of His own infinite Will, free, after the likeness of His own Almighty Will, Who doth whatsoever pleaseth Him. . . . Man has still the power to refuse even the overwhelming, sweet, attractive, all but compulsory, power of the love of God.'

People sometimes speak as if we were to conceive of God's Omnipotence as absolutely without restriction, and that in all spheres of operation—intellectual, moral, material. But surely this is a superficial view. The Almighty is a Law unto Himself. He cannot transgress the necessary conditions, whether intellectual or moral, of His own Self-existent Nature and Being. He is what He is; and, being what He is, He is the crown and perfection and pattern of all Being, and cannot be other than He is. Thus, whatever would be a real contradiction, intellectual or moral, is impossible and inconceivable, even, perhaps we should rather say, most of all, in the Divine Nature, which, unless conceived of as conditioned by Itself, and consistent with Itself, must seem whimsical, arbitrary, and grotesque.

That God will always accept sincere repentance is indeed most true. For His own love, while it condemns, longs for the sinner; and the infinite submission, in life and in death, of His Divine Son in man's nature is an infinite reparation for the infinite wrong done by sin to Him Whom it would dethrone and annihilate, and so has rendered forgiveness possible. What must be remembered is, that we have no grounds for believing that God will interfere to render that repentance possible which a man has, wilfully and persistently, put away from himself, until by habitual sin he has rendered himself incapable of it.

And that the time for repentance is limited to this life would seem to be the uniform teaching of Holy Scripture and of the Church; while certainly, if this be so, it must be the height of cruelty to give hints, as Dr. Farrar does, of possible renewed opportunities of that essential moral change

in the unseen state. Of moral *development* in that state, in the direction already taken, we concede the largest possibility; but that is altogether another thing. The Church has always held that. Hence her practice, from primitive Christian and even from Jewish days, of Prayer for the faithful departed, the withdrawal (not prohibition) of which by our own Reformers we of later days have come to see has been attended with serious practical loss to English religion. We are glad to observe that, in his Preface, Dean Goulburn says:—

‘I entirely share the feeling, which is now so commonly avowed, that Protestants have not given that prominence to the doctrine of the intermediate, as distinct from the ultimate, state, which Scripture so clearly asserts, and the assertion of which is quite necessary to exhibit, in full symmetry and significance, the orthodox doctrine of the Last Things’ (p. vii.).

It is needless to say that Dr. Pusey says the same.

Of course no treatment of this subject can avoid touching on the word *αἰώνιος*. Dr. Pusey and Dean Goulburn alike devote some valuable pages to its discussion; both referring to the late Rev. J. Riddell’s note on the word subjoined to Dr. Pusey’s sermon (1864) *On Everlasting Punishment*, to which sermon his present work, actually occasioned by Dr. Farrar’s Westminster Sermons, is really an Appendix. We are glad to find that the Dean objects to one attempted mode of lowering the meaning of *αἰώνιος* by appealing to the *χρόνος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι* of Rev. x. 6. He says: ‘If you ask me to conceive of Time and Space as *really and objectively annihilated*, my answer is, that my mind is not so constructed that I *can* conceive of such a thing.’ No doubt he is philosophically correct. Time and Space are necessary conditions of all created and finite existence. Only God is absolute ‘Spirit,’ and so *immensus* and *æternus*, alike unrelated to Space and to Time. The Dean might have added a protest against the very common mistranslation of that text, which really means, as the context shows, ‘There shall be no more delay,’ and so have cut away the ground from under the baseless inferences founded upon it. Eternity in the sense of *Timelessness*, unbeginning, unending, is only predicable of the Divine Existence. Our belief is that *αἰώνιος* has a distinct meaning from *Eternal* in that sense. Distinguishing between the *æternitas à parte antè*, in which God existed alone before Creation was, and the unending succession of Time, and of Ages, which began with Creation, and which is called the *æternitas à parte post*, we should say that a survey of the New Testament usage of *αἰώνιος* points to its exclusive use of the latter. In the

æternitas à parte antè there was no Time, there were no *αἰῶνες*: It was not even itself an *αἰών*; for *αἰών* means an age which has a beginning, and, however long, an ending. With Creation Time began, and with Time an *αἰών*, which was itself a terminable period, though immediately succeeded by, or rather passing into (for *συντέλεια* implies an overlapping), and that (it may be) insensibly, or, at least, not always catastrophically; another *αἰών*, to be itself succeeded by another and another, without end. This endless succession gives rise to the phrase *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας* [seven times in New Testament; six in Doxologies, once (S. Luke i. 33) of the Reign of Christ]; or the stronger form *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων* [seven times in the Epistles, always in Doxologies, and fourteen times in the Apocalypse, *i.e.* six times in Doxologies, twice of the Life of God, once of the Life of Christ, once of the Reign of Christ, once of the reign of His Saints, three times of torment, *scil.* of the worshippers of the Beast, of the fallen Babylon, of the Devil]; both forms denoting that which goes on age after age. Adjectivally the same is expressed by *αἰώνιος*, which no more means 'age-long,' *i.e.* lasting for an age, and then ending with the end of the age, than *æternus* means ending with the *ætas*, but means 'ages long,' *i.e.* going on, age after age, during the *æternitas à parte post*, *i.e.* from the moment (within the period since Time began) at which that to which the epithet is applied began, and onwards without end. Thus *αἰώνιος*, which occurs seventy-one times in the New Testament, is used fifty-five times of eternal life, glory, &c., and seven times of eternal fire, judgment, &c.; twice in the phrase *πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων*, which means, in the Divine eternity *à parte antè*, before time and æons began; once in *μυστηρίον χρόνους αἰωνίους σεσχημένον* (Rom. xvi. 25), which means, not as A. V. *before the world began* (which would rather be *πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων*), nor *through eternal ages* (as the Revised English Bible of Drs. Jacob and Green), for the ages are not eternal *à parte antè*, but *during the times of the ages*, *i.e.* that preceded the fulness of time. The passage is exactly parallel to Eph. iii. 9: *τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων*, where A. V. paraphrastically, but correctly, has 'from the beginning of the world.' It is remarkable that *αἰώνιος* is but once applied to God (Whose Eternal Self-Existence is otherwise expressed, as, *e.g.* Rev. i. 4, 8; iv. 8; xi. 17; xvi. 5); and this, we think, illustrates its true meaning of *never-ending existence in time*, and so looks to the eternity *à parte post*, and not *à parte antè*. And its immediate connexion, in the one place of its occurrence (Rom.

xvi. 27) with the mention of *χρόνοι αἰώνιοι*, seems to point to some such meaning as 'God Who presides over, and orders, the course of the ages, and guides their development and succession.' Compare the one parallel, 1 Tim. i. 17, *τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων*, where, very curiously, as in Rom. xvi. 27, and nowhere else, except Jude 25, the doxology which follows is addressed *μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ*. The remaining five occasions of its use are: once of the Spirit (if the reading be not *ἀγίου*); once of the Gospel; once of the Covenant; once in a doxology; and once of Onesimus, who, returning to his master, Philemon, a baptized brother in Christ, becomes his for ever in the abiding relationship of the everlasting Communion of Saints. Excluding the seven passages in which it is applied to punishment, its meaning in which is the point under discussion, there is, in the *New Testament*, absolutely no ground for Dr. Farrar's assertions that 'there is no authority whatever for rendering it everlasting;' that 'it is used over and over again of things transitory.' All his argument in support of which (*Eternal Hope*, Excursus iii.) is based on fifteen passages of the Septuagint version of the Old Testament.

Dr. Pusey's work, which has all the marks of exhaustive fulness and scholarly accuracy which we are accustomed to look for from him, must necessarily take its place as a standard work on this solemn subject; all the more so from its calm judicial fairness, and its repudiation, in the name of the Church and of Theology, of the ignorant extravagance of much popular language, of Calvinistic origin, which has provoked the reaction of which Dr. Farrar's book is one among many evidences. He rightly appraises the elements of truth in that reaction. Taking the four points on which Dr. Farrar dwells, he says of the first, 'The physical torments, the material agonies of eternal punishment,' that it is 'a point not declared to be essential to the belief in Hell.' The second, 'the supposition of its necessarily endless duration for all who incur it,' he strenuously and learnedly maintains as the belief of the Catholic Church from the first, as of the Jews 'before or about the time of our Lord,' and afterwards 'until the theory of the limitation of its duration for the Jew was invented by one who lived after the Ascension of our Lord' (p. 100)—*i.e.* by the Rabbi Akiba, of whose teaching, as of that of the Talmud, on this point, Dr. Pusey gives a very full and most interesting summary. Dr. Farrar's third stumbling-block was 'the opinion that it is thus incurred by the vast mass of mankind;' of which Dr. Pusey says that 'it has no

solid foundation whatever ;' that 'most of us, happily, in our youth heard nothing of all this, or of the Calvinistic dogma of "reprobation," except to hear it rejected as something terrible.' Of the fourth difficulty, 'that it is a doom passed irreversibly at the moment of death on all who die in a state of sin ;' he remarks that it is 'probably a misconception'—*i.e.* that it should be clearly understood that, in accepting it, we must mean by 'a state of sin' such a state 'as excludes any presence of God's grace, however invisible to man, in the heart.'

Looking at the whole controversy, we may well adopt the following words of Dr. Pusey (p. 102): 'Amid all which is so sad, Dr. Farrar may, unintentionally, render good service to the Church and to souls by forcing attention to the intermediate state.'

Furthermore, we feel sure that our readers will thank us if, with a view to guiding their thoughts on this whole subject, so difficult and so momentous, we present them with his very valuable summary of twelve principal propositions, which may be regarded as certainly true, and, if so, are fundamental to the whole question :—

'1. Without Free-Will man would be inferior to the lower animals, which have a sort of limited freedom of choice.

'2. Absolute Free-Will implies the power of choosing amiss and, having chosen amiss, to persevere in choosing amiss. It would be self-contradictory that Almighty God should create a free agent capable of loving Him, without being capable also of rejecting His love.

'3. The higher and more complete and pervading the Free-Will is, the more completely an evil choice will pervade and disorder the whole being.

'4. But without Free-Will we could not freely love God. Freedom is a condition of love.

'5. In eternity those who behold him will know what the bliss is eternally to love Him. But then that bliss involves the intolerable misery of losing Him through our own evil choice.' [We suppose this would be more accurately worded : 'But then *the possibility* of that bliss involves *the possibility* of the intolerable misery of,' &c.] 'To lose God and be alienated from Him is in itself Hell, or the vestibule of Hell.

'6. But that His creatures may not lose Him, God, when He created all His rational creatures with Free-Will, created them also in Grace, so that they had the full power to choose aright, and could not choose amiss, except by resisting the drawing of God to love Him.

'7. The only hindrance to man's salvation is, in any case, the obstinate misuse of that Free-Will, with which God endowed him, in order that he might freely love Him.

'8. God wills that all should be saved, if they *will* it, and to this end gave His Son to die for them, and the Holy Ghost to teach them.

'9. The merits of Jesus reach to every soul who wills to be saved, whether in this life they knew Him or knew Him not.

'10. God the Holy Ghost visits every soul which God has created; and each soul will be judged as it responded or did not respond to the degree of light which He bestowed on it—not by our maxims, but by the wisdom and love of Almighty God.

'11. We know absolutely nothing of the proportion of the saved to the lost, or who will be lost; but this we *do* know, that none will be lost who do not obstinately to the end and in the end refuse God. None will be lost, whom God *can* save without destroying in them His own gift of Free-Will.

'12. With regard to the *nature* of the sufferings, nothing is matter of faith. No one doubts that the very special suffering will be the loss of God (*pœna damni*): that, being what they are, they know that they were made by God for Himself, and yet, through their own obstinate will, will not have Him. As to "pains of sense," the Church has nowhere laid down as a matter of faith the material character of the worm and the fire, or that they denote more than the gnawing of remorse. Although then it would be very rash to lay down dogmatically that the "fire" is *not* to be understood literally, as it has been understood almost universally by Christians, yet no one has a right to urge these representations, from which the imagination so shrinks, as a ground for refusing to believe in Hell, since he is left free not to believe them'—(pp. 22, 23.)

We will only add, as to this last point, two remarks—

1. That but little would seem really to be gained in mitigation of the thought of Eternal punishment by the elimination of the element of 'pains of sense' from our conception of it; since it is admitted that its chiefest anguish must lie in the gnawing consciousness of hopeless separation from God and from good, of everlasting association with evil, within and without, of failure to attain the end of our being, of moral degradation and death and nonentity, of the loss of all self-respect and hope, of 'shame and everlasting contempt.'

2. That really deep thought on this awful theme—thought that is not deterred from facing its realities by such features as, very naturally, strike the imagination, *primâ facie*, with more especial but, perhaps, with disproportionate horror—seems compelled to admit that 'pains of sense' must be a part of everlasting punishment. Man's material organization is an essential part of himself: 'body, soul, and spirit' are his constituent elements, without any one of which he were more or less than man, or, rather, could not *really* be. Death is

the casting-off of the gross visible part of our materiality, whereby, during this present life, we are put into necessary relation with the objects of this lower world, and at the same time protected from the overpowering impact of the objects of the spiritual world, and is the introduction of the man to the tremendous realities of the unseen. But it may well be doubted whether it is the complete de-materialization, even for the time of the intermediate state, of the soul and spirit. Our belief is, as we have intimated above, that the Divine Being alone is purely and absolutely spiritual; that all created beings, being finite, are localized in space, are here and not there, and must move from place to place (Holy Scripture clearly indicates this of the holy angels); and so are defined in space by a material envelope. We use the word 'material,' of course, in its strictly philosophical sense. The 'material' of superhuman or 'celestial' bodies may be ethereal and subtle in the highest degree. There may be almost no limit to the tenuity of matter; for matter is relative to the acuteness of the percipient. The invisible air in an empty room is as strictly 'material' as its floor and its walls. What is 'material' is not, then, a question of what is to our present perceptions visibly and palpably apparent. And the highest vital and sentient powers in man may well reside really, not in the grosser body which we see, and which is their instrument for operation and manifestation, but in some subtler material organism which we cannot see, and which may remain, after it has thrown off its grosser husk at death, as the abiding material tenement of soul and spirit, even in the intermediate state. So remaining it may, very conceivably, be the subject, in the most literal sense, of 'pains of sense' of a degree of acuteness, of which the grosser organization of the present life is incapable. Something like this seems to lie in the narrative of the rich glutton's experience in Hades. He had sinned in over-indulgence of the organ of taste: he suffered in that organ, by a retribution which not only was just as an imposed penalty, but was (may we not think?) a necessary consequence. And so it may well be in the case of other perversion or abuse of man's material nature, which is so grievously prostituted to the service of iniquity. Was it not, in S. Paul's estimate, a main point of 'the terror of the Lord,' knowing which he persuaded men, such men as Felix, that 'every one must receive τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος? Does not conscience itself witness to the truth and justice of such a retribution? And if, as the story of the rich glutton intimates, such retribution is immediate, even in the

intervening disembodied state, with what 'fearful looking for of judgment' must the lost anticipate its greater intensity after the resurrection and final sentence at the judgment-seat of Christ?

As to the question of 'fire,' and its action, whether in Hades during the intermediate state, or in Hell after the Resurrection, we know not, perhaps, what fire is. Scripture expresses, as it only can, the deeper realities of more spiritual states of being by terms which designate the corresponding objects or agencies in this our present earthly life. So here we may, perhaps, apply the important principle of proportionate interpretation, and understand the Bible representations to mean that which to the then organization (possibly, as we have said, far more acutely sensitive) shall be what fire, inward or outward, is to the present bodily frame.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Collects of the Day. An Exposition, Critical and Devotional, of the Collects appointed at the Communion. With Preliminary Essays on their Structure, Sources, and General Character, and Appendices containing Expositions of the Discarded Collects of the First Prayer-Book of 1549, and of the Collects of Morning and Evening Prayer. By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.D., Dean of Norwich. In Two Volumes. (London : Rivingtons, 1880.)

THIS lengthy title gives so full an account of the contents of Dean Goulburn's book that we need only add to it our sincere recommendation of these volumes to our readers. The work is eminently characteristic of its author. All who value the piety of the matter and the gracefulness of the manner and style of the devotional works of the esteemed Dean of Norwich will find this new treatise not below the standard of any of its predecessors. And, to many readers, the Collects of the Prayer-Book, thus explained and annotated, will open a new and most profitable field of thought and inquiry. The preliminary essay is very interesting, and it will help many of its readers to appreciate the beauty and dignity and masterly conciseness of an ancient collect in contrast to the vapid and verbose effusions of most modern prayer writers. As to the much disputed meaning of the word collect, the Dean of Norwich, after proposing the three usual explanations of its meaning—a collection

or gathering up of the people's prayers by the officiating priest; or else the gathering up, or condensing in a succinct form, of the teaching of the day's Epistle and Gospel; or, finally, the gathering of the people for divine worship, *collecta* being merely an abbreviation of the phrase 'oratio ad collectam'—comes to this decision: 'To my mind this last explanation of the word seems to be, not indeed the most attractive, but the most likely to be the true one.' A more charming present than this book for the Sunday reading of young people could not easily be found.

The Worship of the Old Covenant, considered more especially in relation to that of the New. By the Rev. E. F. WILLIS, M.A., Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon Theological College. (Oxford and London: James Parker and Co., 1880.)

IT is probably a common experience of those, who have ever turned to examine the structure and symbolism of the English Liturgy, to feel that there is in it a variety and complexity of references and affinities which seem at first disorderly beyond recall. Now one aspect of the manifold act, and now another, comes into prominence: at one moment the worshipper is with the Ancient Church beneath the thunder and the smoke of Sinai; at another he is standing as with the crowds in Galilee to be taught by the Word of Wisdom; now he is joined to angels and archangels, now to the chosen twelve in the first Christian Church, the upper chamber at Jerusalem. And under all this multiplicity of relation and suggestion there lives the mysterious dualism of the Sacrifice and the Feast: a dualism whose perfect reconciliation is indeed prophesied alike by the analogous conceptions found in almost every worship, and by the anticipation of the Christian consciousness, but which yet remains as the source of two streams of thought which no human mind can perfectly, and at the same moment, blend in one. And if the first impression which is given by the English Liturgy be of variety and confusion, rather than of order or simplicity, far more is this the case when the student turns to the worship of the Eastern or of the Ancient Church. Thus in the *Liturgy of S. Chrysostom*, with the sustained and intense symbolism of its elaborate ritual, with its continuous and dramatic remembrance of the very details in the life and works of Christ,¹ with its exclusion of the element of time in the enactment of the heavenly mystery,² the thought of unity seems lost in the exuberant wealth of meaning, as the sunlight is broken by the luxuriance of a tropical forest.

There are two thoughts which must make every Christian scholar patient, and reverent, and hopeful in his bearing towards this appearance of disorder in the Church's worship. For first he must have learnt that such an appearance often belongs to the first aspect of divinely ordered systems; that 'it is ever a mark of human origin when a scheme is simple to the human mind.'³ In the depth and

¹ Cf. Romanoff, *The Liturgy of S. John Chrysostom*, p. 7.

² Cf. Hammond's *Antient Liturgies*, p. xxxvii.

³ O'Neill, *Christian Unity*, p. 178.

complexity of God's earlier revelations, whose ranges of meaning stretched still into infinitude before the author of the 119th Psalm ; in the apparent irregularity of the moral order ; in the fragmentariness of nature and the lawlessness of genius ; in all these he must have been trained to suspect a unity not of this world, whenever he seems to see disorder working together for good. For, 'lo, these are parts of His ways : but how little a portion is heard of Him.' Such an unity, then, he may well hope to find hereafter in the complexity of the Catholic Liturgies ; their Pattern is in the Mount, from whence no light can quite unbroken reach this earth.

And, secondly, the appearance of disorder is an unfailing note in the outcome of a long development. The manifold entanglement of the highest and oldest civilizations, the baffling interdependences of the legal code, the subtlety and hesitation with which learning and experience break up the simplicity of ruder ages : analogies such as these must suggest that the work of many centuries is hidden in that complexity and confusion which meets our first glance towards the highest forms of human thought and feeling. It is not easy to grasp at once the whole meaning, to penetrate the inmost depth of that which the wisdom and love of countless generations have patiently contrived : it is not likely that simplicity will be the obvious characteristic of Liturgies which are the latest utterance of thoughts and hopes older than sin itself.

It is with a true sense of this difficulty in discerning the essential unity and order of Eucharistic worship and doctrine, and with the result of pointing the reader to some such resolution of the difficulty as has here been sketched, that Mr. Willis has written his book on the *Worship of the Old Covenant, considered more especially in relation to that of the New*. For the motto of the book might be taken his quotation from S. Ambrose (p. 14), 'Umbra præcessit, secuta est imago, erit veritas. Umbra in lege, imago vero in Evangelio, veritas in coelestibus.' Its main thought is rendered in the sphere of art among the mosaics of Ravenna, where Abel on the left-hand brings his lamb, and Melchizedek upon the right his Host, to an altar upon which stands the two-handled chalice of the early Church : while from Heaven the Hand of God is sent forth to bless the one Oblation made from the foundation of the world. The Church on earth comes in the order of God's work between the faithful Israel and the Church Triumphant : the Christian Altar stands between the Jewish Temple and the golden Altar which is before God in Heaven. Should not its ritual and rubrics hold some analogous relation to the book of Leviticus upon the one hand, and the Apocalypse upon the other ?

After the writer's purpose and plan have been in the first chapter clearly defined, in the second the essential and primæval expression of worship by sacrifice is shown to be divinely willed ; and then the greater part of the book is given to a careful and complete account of the whole system of worship under the Mosaic dispensation : an account in which many Cuddesdon men will gratefully recognize that faithful and affectionate attention to the Divine revelation which

has been so helpful a characteristic of Mr. Willis' teaching. The divinely appointed ritual, classification, place, and ministry of the Jewish sacrifices are fully described with a watchfulness of study which seems to leave no hint of symbolism unexplored : the character and intention of the various offerings is explained, and their continuance and union in the one great oblation faithfully traced.¹ The means and order of purification, by which the defiled and out-cast Israelite might return to the worship of his fathers, and the divinely appointed times of sacrifice, are the last subjects treated, before the writer returns to claim once more that in 'the great pattern and example of Divine worship given once for all by God Himself' we have 'the norm and rule to which all true worship must in its measure correspond.' In conclusion some of the chief and plainest teaching of this pattern and example is resumed under five heads :—

'On looking back over the history of the worship enjoined by God upon His Ancient Church, we have found that it is marked by these five characteristics ; it is sacrificial, mediatorial, ceremonial, symbolical, and costly. And since these are the characteristics of the worship which God himself appointed, we may infer that all worship which is to be acceptable to God, must, in its degree, partake of those same characteristics ; these may be said to be the marks or notes of a true and acceptable worship. The notion that God is likely to be pleased with a worship of unadorned simplicity finds no warrant whatever in Holy Scripture ; nor has such a notion of worship ever been sanctioned in the Church of Christ.'

The teaching of the Old Testament in regard to ritual could hardly perhaps be better summarized, unless it were in the simple words of Hooker : 'God hath nowhere revealed that He loves to dwell beggarly.'

The first of the four appendices with which the book closes may warrant a hope that in his new field of work, as leading the Oxford Mission to Calcutta, in noble rivalry to the Cambridge Mission to Delhi, and devoting to the Church of India the powers of study and expression which have been loyally and fruitfully spent during the last ten years in the training of the English clergy, Mr. Willis may be able to enter further into the comparative study of the universal instinct of sacrificial worship : that he may draw from the philosophy and religion of the East yet more illustration of the one great thought which is the central truth of worship, and strikes as a flash of pure light through all the confusion of heathendom. In the second appendix the true meaning of *εὐαθής*, in Heb. ix. 16, 17, is shown to be that which it bears in all other passages in the Septuagint and the New Testament, the meaning of 'covenant' ; the third is given to a lucid account of the inquiry whether of the two veils of the Temple was rent in twain at the time of our Lord's crucifixion, Mr. Willis maintaining the belief of Origen and of S. Jerome, that

¹ Mr. Willis has worked on parallel lines with Mr. Andrew Jukes' *Law of the Offerings*, but in a more catholic spirit. Mr. Jukes' essay is, in some respects, fuller and deeper than Mr. Willis' inquiry.

the outer veil only was rent : 'Quia nunc ex parte videmus, et ex parte cognoscimus : quum autem venerit quod perfectum est, tunc et velum interius dirumpendum est : ut omnia quæ nunc nobis abscondita sunt, domus Dei sacramenta, videamus.'¹ Lastly, in a short essay of great interest, the principle of oral confession of sin as a condition of its forgiveness is traced through the discipline of the Jewish Church back to the record of the very first of sins.

There is surely a great fitness in the parting gift which Mr. Willis has chosen to leave with the Church in England. For not only does he go to India to forward the fulfilment of those words which he himself has quoted, as frequent on the lips of the Early Christians, and proving beyond dispute the thesis of his book, the continuity of the true Israel : 'From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, My Name shall be great among the Gentiles ; and in every place incense shall be offered unto My Name, and a pure offering ; for My Name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of Hosts.'² He also has claimed for himself and for his work a place in his brethren's thoughts of that one Act wherein, across all intervals of sea and land, all Christian worship blends before the heavenly Altar, and all who share the one Bread and the one Chalice are made one in the communion of One Holy Spirit.

Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. By HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, Th.D., Oberconsistorialrath, Hannover. 'The Gospels of Mark and Luke.' Vols. I. and II. (Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark, 1880.)

THERE will be but few persons found to doubt that Dr. Meyer's Commentary, which is here translated from the fifth German edition—the last issued by the author himself—is a laborious compilation of exegetical materials bearing on the New Testament ; that the author had a clear and vigorous grasp of the principles of philology, with a sound exegetical sense ; and that the comment is sober, methodical, and orthodox. Its defects appear to us to be a certain dryness and harshness, which do, we think, sometimes prevent his entering fully into the intention of a saying or a discourse. Where a grammatical or critical difficulty is to be solved, or information of any kind sought to illustrate the text, in no Commentary is the seeker more sure to find what he wants than in Meyer.

The volumes before us comprise the Gospels of SS. Mark and Luke, with copious Notes and Introductions, and fully sustain the general high character of the work. As to the former Gospel, it is to be noted that Dr. Meyer was disposed, in common with many later critics, to take a far higher view of the functions of S. Mark and of the Gospel which goes under his name than had been the custom with preceding writers. The earlier theory of Griesbach, that this Gospel was written after those of Matthew and Luke—although it has been upheld by a cloud of critics³—is unhesitatingly (and no

¹ *Hieron. ad Hedib.* iv. 176. Ed. Bened.

² Malachi, i. 11.

³ Fritzsche, De Wette, Bleek, Baur, Delitzsch and others.

doubt rightly) rejected; and with it must fall that refinement upon it by Eichthal, which will even have it that the Gospel is even a mere condensation of the former of its two predecessors.

Whether the supposed Apostolic collection of discourses, or *Logia*, to which Papias refers, were really, as our author thinks, in existence before S. Peter dictated and S. Mark acted as his secretary, must still be held unproved if probable. But if such discourses did exist, and furnished the basis for the Petrine work, it may perhaps be said, without hesitation, that it was the only work resembling the Four which was then extant. The present writer has taken a somewhat unusual view of those much-disputed words of Papias. He regards them as 'amounting more precisely to this—that Mark made notes for himself after the discourses of Peter which he heard, and subsequently employed these in the composition of his Gospel.' Such a view would be in conflict with those other traditions, quite as ancient and constant, that the younger man was the *ἐρμηνεύτης*, interpreter or secretary, of S. Peter; and it seems improbable that he should 'make notes' and carry out a project of this kind *mero motu*, or without the authority and bidding of his chief, whose work it would then become.

The treatment of S. Luke's Gospel in the Introduction seems to us not quite so satisfactory on the whole.

Commentary on S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. By F. GODET, D.D., Professor of Theology, Neuchâtel. Volume I. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1880.)

MORE commentaries probably have been penned upon this Epistle than upon any other single book of the New Testament, and in consequence it has given rise to a very great number of divergent and mutually contradictory views as to its meaning, its ground plan, and the purpose with which it was written. Still we cannot regard the Commentary before us as superfluous; and the deservedly high reputation as an expositor of Scripture which Dr. Godet has obtained will be found not to have suffered in this instance. This exposition of the Epistle is intended to be complete in two volumes, and almost a third of that before us is occupied, as is very natural, with the various prolegomena, including a survey of the literature of the subject, without which no commentary could be considered complete. A brief memoir of S. Paul, in which his career is intelligently treated, precedes the strictly expository portion; but this strikes us as somewhat inadequate. M. Godet manipulates ideas with more success than he narrates facts of biography. At once he attributes to S. Paul, as it appears to us, an exaggerated function in the providential training of the world; and, on the other hand, conceives of his character in too conventional a manner, and without sufficient exertion of living sympathy, so as thereby to do him some injustice. Thus it is certainly an exaggeration to speak, as on p. 15, of the evangelization of the Gentiles as a work for which Jesus had indeed prepared the way, but which 'he had not yet been able to accomplish,' and it savours of hyperbole to call the

Apostle, great as he was, 'the man especially designed and prepared beforehand' for this work.

And we cannot but think that our author is very much astray in his line of comment on S. Paul's conversion. It can hardly at any time have been true of S. Paul that 'the object of his adoration was his *ego*.' The explanation given of the converted Saul's subjective experience of spiritual death and resurrection we must regard as fanciful, if not incorrect. In fact, this Life of S. Paul appears to us to be hasty and wanting in verisimilitude, and we should not be surprised to learn that it was an afterthought.

Far more praiseworthy is the Introduction to the Epistle itself. It is no easy matter, as we need hardly remind our readers, to define exactly the class of persons to whom, and the intention with which, this Epistle was written. One group of critics regards the Roman Church of that day as having been composed mainly of Judaic elements, and the Epistle as *apologetic* in its aim, and intended to remove an adverse impression which the outspoken freedom of S. Paul's teaching had not unnaturally created in the minds of many Jews. Of this school Baur may be taken as the type.

But the testimonies of history that the early Roman Church was Gentile by origin and Pauline in tendency are very numerous and strong; and there is a certain difficulty in supposing the Apostle to have been endeavouring to extend his influence over a community, principally *Fewish*, seeing that it was 'the gospel of the uncircumcision' which had been committed to him' (Gal. ii. 7). A second school, therefore, supposes that although the Roman Church was essentially Gentile, yet that an outbreak of Judæo-Christian legalism had recently taken place in it, as certainly had been the case at Antioch, at Thessalonica, at Corinth, and probably in most of the Churches of Pauline foundation. So that, according to this view, the Epistle was S. Paul's rejoinder to a movement which threatened the entire foundation of his work, as that to the Galatians was intended to be for the Churches throughout Galatia, and the First to the Corinthians for that at Corinth. There are various modifications of this view: it may be called the *polemic* theory.

Passing over the view of Erasmus, that the Apostle *foresaw* such an inroad by Judaizing emissaries upon the Roman Christians, though it had not actually occurred, and so intended by his anti-Judaic teaching to *fortify* them against such an attack whenever it should occur; and also the very singular suggestion of Ewald, that the Epistle was intended to loosen the existing bond between the Jewish synagogue and the Christian Church, which was tending more and more to compromise the latter (chapter xiii.); and lastly, the opinion, which is that of the chief Fathers, of an author so ancient as the compiler of the Muratori fragment on the Canon, as of many of the mediæval writers, namely, that the Epistle is a systematic exposition of Christian doctrine, that it is intended to guide men to Christ, and has no secondary or ulterior aim whatever; we may shortly state our author's own view, which is not exactly identical with any of the foregoing, and appears to us to possess many

elements of truth, and being truly original without ceasing to be conservative may properly be considered as of very high value.

He rightly styles this Epistle the *most systematic* of all those written by S. Paul.¹ Against the unfounded view of Baur, that 'the Apostles had no time, in the midst of their missionary labours, to systematize the Gospel, and to compose a Christian dogmatic' (p. 95), which can only be thought very partially true of any of the twelve, and is demonstrably unfounded in the case of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, he asks with a sudden and convincing *argumentum ad hominem* :—

'Could Baur suppose that a mind of such strength as Paul's was could have lectured for two years before an audience like the cultivated class of the Ephesian population, without having at least traced an outline of the Christian doctrine?'—(p. 96.)

Now it is to be noticed that this course of Apostolic instruction, which had been delivered at Thessalonica, at Corinth, at Ephesus, and no doubt at every place in which the Apostle had been able to stay long enough, not only to plant, but also to organize a Church, had not been delivered at Rome. The Church there had been *sporadic*, self-sown by the concourse thither of believers, one from one city, another from that; Aquila and Priscilla from Ephesus, Epænetus from Achaia. No Apostle had organized it. There were then probably no written Gospels, no Epistles, no manual of Christian doctrine, in existence. The Gospel message had gone thither by the mouths of newly-made converts and had done its work, but the consecrated messenger had not taught and lectured there according to his wont.

He owed, therefore, to the Roman Church, as to other Churches, 'both to the Greeks and to the barbarians, both to the wise and to the unwise' (i. 14), a clear and systematic exposition of the Christian faith; and excluding those points of doctrine of which the formulation was to be the task of a later generation, and which had not yet risen (so to speak) above the horizon of the Christian consciousness, with the exception of these, it will be found to be precisely such an exposition :—

'A community of believers had been formed in this city without his assistance. No doubt he reckoned on being there himself soon; but once more he might be prevented; he knew how many dangers attended his approaching journey to Jerusalem. And besides, should he arrive at Rome safe and sound, he had too much tact to think of putting the members of such a Church as it were on the catechumens' bench. In these circumstances, how natural the idea of filling up by means of writing the blank which Providence had permitted, and of giving, in an *epistolary treatise* addressed to the Church, the Christian instruction which it had missed, and which was indispensable to the solidity of its faith! The Apostle of the Gentiles was not able to establish the Church in the metropolis of the Gentile world . . . the work was taken out of his hands; what shall he do? He will found it anew. Under the already constructed edifice he will insinuate a powerful substruction—to wit, his

¹ Calvin says of it, '*tota methodica est.*'

apostolic doctrine systematically arranged, as he expounds it everywhere else *visâd voce*. If such is the origin of the Epistle to the Romans, we have in it nothing less than the course of religious instruction, and in a way the dogmatic and moral catechism of S. Paul. In this explanation there is no occasion for the question why this instruction was addressed to Rome rather than to any other Church. Rome was the only great Church of the Gentile world to which Paul felt himself burdened with such a debt. This is the prevailing thought in the preface of his Epistle, and by which he clears the way for the treatment of his subject.'—(*Ibid.*)

In order to establish this hypothesis, Dr. Godet points to the *systematic* form of the treatise, which commences, after the brief explanation why he had taken upon himself to write, the expressly stated theme (i. 16, 17) which serves as its basis, the methodical development of this theme, first in the dogmatic sphere (i.-xi.), then in the moral sphere (xii.-xv.). It is no small recommendation of this view also, that under it those elements of anti-Jewish polemic in the Epistle which have so puzzled the majority of commentators, fall naturally into their proper place. For it would have been hardly possible for the Apostle to expound the way of salvation through the Gospel without taking notice of that older system which had so long been acting (according to his view) as a preparation for the Gospel, and was now being set up by Judaizers as its rival; nor could he establish the former without setting aside the latter.

It will be sufficient, however, for us to have indicated the chief points of this very striking and important Introduction to the Epistle. It will, we have no doubt, have considerable influence on contemporary expositions.

The notes are generally good and sound, but do not require special notice. In fact the text of this Epistle is trodden ground, and it would not be easy for the annotator to say anything very original upon it.

The Pulpit Commentary. Edited by the Rev. Canon H. D. M. SPENCE, M.A., Vicar and Rural Dean of St. Pancras, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, and by the Rev. JOSEPH P. EXELL, Editor of the *Homiletic Quarterly*.—EZRA, NEHEMIAH, ESTHER. (London: C. Kegan Paul and Co., 1880.)

We commented in our last number on a throng of works of this class, and the cry is 'still they come,' so that we have both entirely new publications and fresh instalments of the old before us again for review. The *Pulpit Commentary*, which we take first, principally because of its larger size, may be described as an enterprise with not only a new name, but also a new purpose, and a method to a considerable extent novel. It proposes to itself, as its *raison d'être*, to render help to preachers in the composition of their sermons. Accordingly, each section of the work is divided into three parts. The first is a brief commentary of the ordinary type; and this is by one person. Then another writer follows with what is called the 'Homiletics,' *vis.* the text treated in a broad and general manner, and

with the moral aspects of the narrative just suggested or 'roughed out.' Thirdly follows another stage in the sermon manufacture, consisting of two or three sermons, or 'Homilies,' by various authors, upon subjects suggested by the foregoing section. We believe that some of the contributors are Nonconformists. For example, the *Homiletics* on Neh. xii. 1-26, in which, in the enumeration of the 'ministers' of the Christian Church, 'pastors and preachers' take the place of 'bishops and priests,' can scarcely have been written by a Churchman.

It is practically but a small instalment that is given here, because the three books included in this volume are very similar to each other, and give little clue to the manner in which the plan could be carried out in books like that of Job, or of the Proverbs, in which we should fancy the various parts of the Commentary must irresistibly coalesce. So far, however, it seems to have been carried out with care and fair success; and there can be no doubt of its being a vast help to any one wishing to preach sermons on those parts of Scripture. It is an obvious objection that the sermons, when written or preached, could hardly be in any sense *original*, but must tend more and more towards a tame uniformity. We fear the plan of the work will lend itself but too easily to indolent habits, and encourage some among preachers to take but too readily this cut-and-dried mental *pabulum*—this homiletic 'Thorley's Food for Cattle'—instead of that which they have gathered and prepared with their own toil of thought and reflection, and which, therefore, is the outcome of their own best selves—the 'things new and old,' which, like wise scribes, they bring forth for the spiritual sustenance of their people. Few things could be more dangerous to the spiritual life, or more certain to dwarf the intellectual powers, of any priest, than for him habitually to stand before his people with compositions which were actually or virtually the work of some other man. Still, we do not say but that it may be perfectly possible to use works like the *Pulpit Commentary* without abusing them.

Par Palimpsestorum Dubliniensium. The Codex Rescriptus Dublinensis of S. Matthew's Gospel (Z), first published by Dr. Barrett in 1801. A New Edition, revised and augmented. Also, Fragments of the Book of Isaiah in the LXX. Version, from an ancient Palimpsest, now first published: Together with a new discovered Fragment of the *Codex Palatinus*. By T. K. ABBOTT, B.D., Fellow of Trinity College, and Professor of Biblical Greek in the University of Dublin. (Dublin: Hodges & Co., 1880.)

THE eccentric Vice-Provost Barrett, known to the readers of Lever's Irish novels, as well as to the textual critics of the New Testament, discovered Codex Z in 1787, and published it in 1801. His edition, however, has met with scant favour from succeeding labourers in the same field, and Dr. Tregelles in his 'Printed Text of the New Testament,' published in 1854, suggested to the authorities of Trinity College the republication of 'Dr. Barrett's (so-called) facsimile, with the addition of all that can now be given' (p. 168). In order to

facilitate such an enterprise, this eminent critic inserted in a copy of Dr. Barrett's work the further results which he had obtained by a chemical restoration of the original. The authorities, if they waited for a quarter of a century to fulfil the task, have, through the care and zeal of Professor Abbott, performed it now with a completeness which Dr. Tregelles himself did not anticipate. For the learned Professor, besides reading about four hundred letters and marks undeciphered before, has corrected eleven errors of Barrett and five of Tregelles, and ascertained thirteen readings before doubtful. He defends his Irish predecessor with considerable success against the accusations of inaccuracy which have been brought against him, and gives a curious illustration of the proverb that they who live in glass houses should not throw stones, by the fact that the MS. of Dr. Tregelles, left by him in Trinity College, differs in not less than twenty instances from the account of his discoveries which he himself printed in London.

Professor Abbott modestly and very reasonably ascribes his success to the fact that, living on the spot, he was able to examine the Codex in various lights, and to recur to it at many intervals. Most of us are acquainted with the curious psychological fact that if we lay aside for a time a puzzling piece of penmanship it often reveals itself to us with perfect clearness the next time we take it up. Mr. Abbott's studious carefulness and laborious habits, already proved in the fields of ethics and philosophy, are a guarantee to us that now at least we possess correctly the whole information which this ancient record has to give us. But its practical importance lies but in its confirmation of other authorities. There is not, we believe, any important passage in which the reading is determined by Z.

If the present possessors of the treasure have done their duty by it, all is not more than enough to atone for the outrages inflicted on it by their predecessors. We experience a sensation not unlike that of reading the account of a hideous murder, when Dr. Tregelles informs us that the MS. was rebound since Dr. Barrett's time by a craftsman who knew nothing of the original uncial letters, and paid attention merely to the more modern and comparatively worthless cursive writing of the palimpsest. Under this impression he strengthened the pages by pasting vellum over the margins, and cut the edges smooth and neat, thus burying or cutting away some ancient letters which Dr. Barrett had read. He mistook the traces of the ancient writing for *dirt*, and in some places attempted to obliterate it. These atrocities Professor Abbott is obliged to admit, and raises a doubt only upon the crowning indictment, that in some places where the writing instrument of the ancient copyist had furrowed the vellum, a new surface of *size* or some substance of the kind has been superadded.

The pages of the volume in which Z is found measure $8\frac{1}{4}$ by 6 inches. It contains 110 folios arranged in groups of four sheets each, of which twelve are lost. The later writing of the volume consists of extracts from SS. Basil, Chrysostom, and others. But of the 110, 69 folios are palimpsest. Of these twenty-nine contain portions of S. Gregory of Nazianzus, which, though in uncial letters,

belong probably to the ninth century ; eight contain the fragments of Isaiah, and thirty-two those of S. Matthew. These thirty-two are all that remain of 120 folios, of which the MS. originally consisted. Nor is this the only loss. The vellum was cut down by the later scribe to the extent of full two inches each way in every page ; and the new folds which he was therefore obliged to make were mistaken by Tregelles for joinings. The writing is in very beautiful 'round and square' uncials. Its antiquity is shown by the absence of breathings and accents, which were introduced probably in the fifth century but did not at once come into universal use ; by the fact that only the most ancient forms of abbreviation are used, and the simple point for punctuation. The mere fact that the letters are uncial is no proof in itself of greater antiquity than the eighth or ninth century ; but certain particulars in the forms of the letters, such as the absence of ornament, point to an age long previous to this. That the MS. is not so old as the Vatican or Sinaitic is shown by the large initials to the paragraphs, a method of writing first adopted in the fifth century. Z always begins a paragraph with a fresh line, herein agreeing with *Codex Ephr. Rescr.* The practice is partially adopted in the Sinaitic and Alexandrian, but is absent in the Vatican. On the whole, Professor Abbott shows a tendency to ascribe the MS. with Hug to the fifth century ; but the authority of some eminent experts restrains him from absolutely claiming for it an antiquity higher than the latter part of the sixth. It compares favourably in accuracy with its rivals in age ; the editor computes that, in the same space, Vatican displays ten times and Sinaitic three times as many clerical errors.

The writing of the fragment of the Septuagint much resembles Z, and may probably equal if not exceed it in age. But it only contains the passages Isaiah xxx. 2 to xxxi. 7, and xxxvi. 17 to xxxviii. 1.

The beautiful leaf of purple MS. which completes Professor Abbott's valuable publication belongs to the *Codex Palatinus* of S. John and S. Luke with portions of the other Evangelists in the old African Latin version. The body of the MS. is in the Imperial Library at Vienna, where it was acquired since the beginning of the century, nobody knows whence or how. Perhaps, in recording these doubts concerning the Austrian acquisition, Professor Abbott may mean to bar any claim upon the part of that library for a surrender on the part of Dublin. It is indeed very probable that both the separated portions may have been stolen from some third quarter. But a single leaf would at all events be safer with the volume to which it belongs, of which obvious reflection the history of this very fragment affords a proof. For after an account had been given of it by the late Dr. Todd in the Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy, it was lost in the library of Trinity College, and only recovered, after a laborious voyage of discovery, by the good fortune of Mr. French, an intelligent assistant in the institution.

Legenda Sanctorum. The Proper Lessons for Saints' Days, according to the use of Exeter.—Compiled by JOHN GRANDISSON, Bishop, 1327. Reprinted and Edited, with an extended Preface, by HERBERT EDWARD REYNOLDS, M.A., Priest-Vicar and Librarian of Exeter Cathedral. (London: Elliot Stock, 1880.)

WE have before us the first fasciculus of Mr. Reynolds' most welcome publication. Antiquaries and liturgicists have long known from Dr. Oliver, and from Mr. Maskell's description, that the library of Exeter Cathedral possesses a most valuable fourteenth-century manuscript *Legenda*, in two volumes, presented to the Cathedral by Bishop Grandisson on Lady Day, 1366. One of these tomes contains the lessons from Holy Scripture and the Homilies *quæ pertinent ad temporale*; and the other comprises the proper lessons for Saints' Days according to Exeter use in the *commune sanctorum*, together with some peculiar to that church. Mr. Reynolds proposes to issue a *literatim* reprint of both volumes. Books of Lessons are of the greatest rarity, and the Exeter *Legenda* is one of the most precious and instructive of those that have come down to us. It is notable, in particular, for the compiler's exercise of the critical faculty as to the text which he follows, and for the practical good sense which led him to abbreviate the lessons for public reading. The Bishop seems to have freely exercised the power which originally belonged to the episcopal office of ruling the details of Divine worship in his diocese. The title of this manuscript is *Incipit Legenda de usu Exoniensis ecclesie secundum ordinationem et abbrevacionem Johannis de Grandissono Episcopi*. Mr. Reynolds has prefixed a rather rambling and discursive preface, full of archæological and liturgical details, but not judiciously digested or arranged. We hope, however, that he may be trusted as a painstaking and careful editor of the text. His first published number contains twenty-two folios of the second volume, comprising the Saints' Day lessons for the months of December and January, beginning with S. Andrew, and ending with S. Bathildes the Queen. It has also the general preface, and two coloured facsimiles: one of the first page of the MS., which is beautifully illuminated, and the other of the first page of the Kalendar. It cannot be doubted, we hope, that Mr. Reynolds will find sufficient subscribers to enable him to complete his task. The *Ordinale* of Bishop Grandisson is to follow.

The Sunday School Centenary Bible (Variorum Teacher's Edition). (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1880.)

THE Queen's Printers deserve no small gratitude from Biblical students for the zeal and enterprise which they have shown in the production of this most useful and comprehensive volume. Never, we think, has so much useful matter been condensed into so wonderfully small a space. The work has evidently been a labour of love alike to its projectors and its editors. No expense has been spared in its compilation, and no pains in the execution of a somewhat difficult task.

The so-called *Teacher's Bible*, issued by the Queen's Printers some five years ago, was a Reference Bible with the addition of some very valuable and compendious 'Aids to Students,' the latter compiled by various scholars, each eminent in his particular line. The same firm published afterwards a *Variorum Bible*, in which the marginal alternative renderings of our Authorized Version were improved and multiplied so as to afford an almost complete conspectus of all that is needed for the revision of the text, according to the latest results of scholarship and inquiry. These two works, combined together and further improved, form the Variorum Teacher's edition of the *Sunday School Centenary Bible*, now under notice.

The Sunday School Centenary formed, no doubt, a convenient time for the completion of this undertaking, and the Queen's Printers have been wise, perhaps, in associating this work with so popular a movement. But we rather regret that an edition which is of real and lasting value should be known by so cumbrous a title, recalling an anniversary, the interest of which will ere long entirely fade away. As another somewhat adverse criticism, we may complain, not unreasonably, of the smallness of the print. It requires young eyes or strong glasses to read with any comfort the closely printed pages of this Bible. We know that it could not be otherwise if a single volume was to contain so much matter, and to be issued in a portable form, and at so small a price as half a guinea. But the necessity for this compression is to be regretted. Once more we may express a wish that the sacred text had been printed in paragraphs rather than in verses. A Paragraph Bible is almost a commentary in itself. And the pages before us, broken up as they are into verses, and crowded with references, are anything but grateful to the reader's eye. Once more, the absence of the Deutero-Canonical Books is greatly to be deplored.

These, however, are but small blots. The work as it is remains a monument of well-intentioned zeal, and well-directed skill, on the part of its publishers and its compilers. The editors of the Old Testament are Mr. Cheyne and Mr. Driver; those of the New Testament, Messrs. Clarke and Goodwin, and Dr. Sanday, the Principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall, Durham. The notes of these gentlemen, compressed into the smallest compass, give an accurate account of the present state of knowledge and opinion as to the text of the Authorized English version. All the chief mistranslations are corrected, and by the quotation of authorities the reader is able at a glance to see what support each such correction relies upon. There can be no doubt of the value of this independent undertaking. It will not only prepare the way for the forthcoming proposed revision of the English text by the Westminster 'companies,' but will enable a large circle of readers to test that revision when it makes its appearance. Differences of reading are distinguished throughout from differences of rendering. The editors have had the great advantage, they tell us, of consulting the as yet unpublished text of the original Greek of the New Testament, as revised by Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort.

We are almost bewildered by the quantity and variety of critical

matter condensed in these pages. It is to be feared that altogether unlearned persons will find the book less useful than its compilers expect. But even scholars will find their account in consulting this compendious volume in preference to larger and separate books of reference. They need seek no further than these pages for notices of all the famous MSS. of the Scriptures, all the versions, and nearly all the commentators, ancient and modern. Here too will be found abstracts and analyses of all the Books of Scripture, lists of the references in the New Testament to the Old Testament, essays on the Parables and Miracles of our Lord, and on the Prophecies relating to Him, with notes on the geography, the chronology, the natural history, and the music of the Bible. Mr. Madden, a well-known authority in numismatics, contributes chapters on the coins and measures of the Old and New Testaments; Sir Joseph Hooker undertakes the plants of the Bible; Dr. Tristram, the animal creation; Mr. Cheyne, a dictionary of proper names, with their meanings, and a revised pronunciation. Mr. Sayce's paper on the ethnology of the Bible, with a linguistic and geographical introduction, and another called 'The Bible and the Monuments,' are of special value. In the latter, the writer considers the historical, the political, the commercial, and the religious relations of the Hebrews with the neighbouring monarchies of Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, Persia, Aram, and Phœnicia. Dr. Lumby provides a very useful glossary of Bible words, illustrated from the writings of authors contemporary with the translators: and there are other useful treatises. Besides which, there are maps, a large concordance, and a full index of persons, places, and subjects. All these, so far as we have examined them, are thoroughly well done.

We have said enough, we are sure, to recommend this volume to our readers. It will form a most valuable present or prize to teachers or learners in Sunday schools. And it will be a most convenient book of reference on a clergyman's study table.

De la certitude et des formes récentes du Scepticisme. Par L. ROBERT, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Rennes. 8vo. (Paris: Emile Thorin, 1880.)

SCPTICISM, we need scarcely say, is a tendency of the human mind as old as thought itself. On the other hand, the forms or outward manifestations of scepticism necessarily vary according to the progress of science, and philosophical doubt borrows its weapons from the arsenals it finds accessible, and which contain stores 'new' as well as 'old.' It is quite evident that the scepticism of Huet, Bayle, and La Motte le Vayer, allowing for a certain identity of first principles, could not be met by the same arguments as the views maintained by Ænesidemus, Sextus Empiricus, Montaigne, and Charron; and, to take more recent examples still, the memoirs of Messrs. Javary (1843), and Véra (1845), on the possibility and legitimacy of metaphysical certainty, do not answer the requirements of the present day. 'For the last thirty years,' says M. Robert in his preface, 'philosophy has been constantly progressing. Former systems have developed

their consequences; doctrines then unknown have come to light; all questions have been renewed, either in consequence of the fresh results obtained, or of the different points of view at which thinkers have placed themselves. It is therefore interesting to inquire, What is now the state of the problem of certainty?

The importance of such an inquiry cannot fail to strike even the persons who care the least for professedly metaphysical discussion, and for what they regard as a dangerous, or, at any rate, an useless, branch of literature. M. Robert very aptly remarks that every one, to a considerable extent, is leavened by the influence of dogmatism on the one hand, or scepticism on the other. Two hundred years ago, M. Jourdain talked prose *sans le savoir*. Now we see the objections of Kant, Auguste Comte, John Stuart Mill, and Mr. Herbert Spencer maintained by persons who certainly have never read the *Cours de Philosophie positive*, or the *Study of First Principles*; and even the *prolétaire*, with all his contempt for what he deems to be vain and useless abstractions, talks glibly about God, a future life, and Christianity.

A work therefore which discusses calmly and impartially the pretensions of scepticism in its various manifestations cannot but be useful, and we are glad to find that M. Robert has undertaken it. Placing himself at once and very frankly at a standpoint diametrically opposed to the one adopted by modern sceptics, he 'repudiates all exclusive doctrines, all that impoverishes the human intellect, all that is calculated to diminish our faith and our love. Nothing seems to him more fatal than the narrowness of mind which coolly suppresses an entire order of facts and of ideas.' The work of M. Robert is subdivided into three parts, treating respectively of the following topics. 1. Certainty in general, scepticism and criticism. 2. The various manifestations of certainty. 3. The criterion and foundation of certainty, and the partial form of scepticism. We cannot of course attempt to examine these various points, interesting as they are, and we must be satisfied with stating here the general impression we have derived from the perusal of M. Robert's work, and which is one of complete agreement with it. Whilst showing admirably the assailable points of the modern forms of scepticism, the author takes care to allow for the elements of truth they contain; and, on the other side, he defends with much power the doctrines of miracles, a Divine revelation, &c., against the trenchant assertions of our freethinking adversaries.

The Jesus of the Evangelists: His Historical Character vindicated; or, An Examination of the Internal Evidence for Our Lord's Divine Mission, with reference to Modern Controversy. By the Rev. C. A. Row, M.A., Prebendary of S. Paul's. Second Edition. (London: Frederick Norgate, 1880.)

THERE have been many treatises on the *external evidences* of the Scriptures of the New Testament. The present is an endeavour, in a systematic form, to state the *internal* argument to their credibility, *i.e.* that founded on the mutual agreement and harmony of the various

elements which make up the personal narrative or the portrait of a Person which they present. Some persons, the writer sets out by observing, 'have endeavoured to resolve the Jesus of the New Testament into an abstract idea or a myth, the foundation of which has been some purely human Jesus, whose real life has been buried under the obscurities of the past.' In order to disprove this contention, the author before us first examines, at considerable length, 'the portraiture of Jesus as it is exhibited in the Gospels,' and then shows that it could not have been developed out of the existing Judaism in any *normal* manner, *i.e.* having regard to the analogy of the intellectual and spiritual history of the race for many ages before. That development had, in fact, proceeded on quite a different line. 'During this period those principles of Judaism took root and flourished which extinguished the spirituality of the prophetic period, substituting externalism for inward religion, and finally hardening themselves into the unbearable yoke of Rabbinism' (p. 150).

This is not very happily worded; but the argument is valid, and even powerful. How could the Judaism which finally blazed up and culminated in the adoption of the pretender, Bar-Cochba, as its Messiah, possibly be thought to have imagined, *mero motu*, the character of the meek and holy Jesus, and 'have decked it with hues of such unearthly and ideal beauty as have never been united in one character since?

The author's analysis and estimate of the Messianic prophecies rather errs, as we think, in severity. He understates their value, we believe; but better this, perhaps, as a matter of evidence in an apologetic work, than the opposite extreme. On the other hand, we cannot but think that the Book of Enoch occupies an unreasonable amount of space in his argument, without a result quite commensurate with the attention devoted to it. Far more valuable is that part of his argument in which he proceeds to urge that the supernatural parts of the narratives in our Gospels cannot be set aside as mythical accretions, since the period which elapsed between the birth of Christianity and the appearance of its Sacred Books or Gospels is insufficient for the gradual formation of such a *mythus*.¹ It may be said that this period (of one hundred years or thereabouts) is at once too short and too long for the result required for the maintainers of the mythic theory: too short, in that the evolution of so exalted a character as that portrayed in the Synoptic Gospels would have required centuries to evolve, supposing it possible, for the sake of argument, that it could thus be originated; and also (though it may seem a paradox) *too long*, since between the completion of the Synoptic Gospels and the appearance of the Fourth Gospel there

¹ 'Although we do not know the length of time which the whole class of myths which together make up Grecian mythology took in their formation, it is certain that any appreciable advance in moral or religious thought, from the fundamental conceptions of the Grecian mythic period to its next stage of progress, occupied a vastly longer interval of time than that which our mythic friends postulate for the elaboration of the Evangelical Jesus from its original Jewish type'—(p. 244).

occurs a measurable interval of sixty-five or seventy years,¹ during which, if the theory of the mythicizers be accurate, a gradual crystallization of mythical details was going on. Now by putting the former and the latter portraits side by side, we ought to be able to detect the difference between the two, if there be any, which is referable to the mythus. But what do we find? The character is essentially the same, with no new characteristics superadded. The miracles are of precisely the same character. There is none of that growth of marvellous detail and circumstance which marks every other hagiology. It was not that the time was indisposed to these; for we see them in the fables of the Mishna: or that the history of the Life of Jesus formed an unsuitable nucleus for such stories, for we may cull them by the score from the Apocryphal Gospels. In point of fact, the myth has *not* grown as the theory requires; there is sober fact before us, and not baseless imaginations; and since it is not for want of *time* for at least the commencement of the crystallizing process that this result has taken place, the reason must be that the faculty tending to euhemerism has been kept in check by the force of truth, or, as Christians would maintain, by the superintending Providence of God.

We cannot, however, do more than indicate the general character of the arguments of this very acute and praiseworthy book. The new edition is substantially the same as the former one, and the treatise well deserves the careful consideration of all students of the Holy Scripture.

The History of the Passion and Resurrection of Our Lord considered in the Light of Modern Criticism. By Dr. F. L. STEINMEYER, Professor of Theology in Berlin. New edition, specially revised for English readers. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1879.)

A GERMAN author, we think it was Gretser, has written three quarto volumes, of about a thousand pages each, upon the archæology of the Cross alone. And therefore we can hardly wonder that another German, Professor Steinmeyer, has expanded the brief narratives of the Gospels into the volume before us, of four hundred closely printed pages. A considerable portion of the work has indeed an apologetic purpose. Its composition was occasioned by the publication of the notorious *Leben Jesu* of David Strauss. Whereas that work hardly went further than an admission of the simple fact of the crucifixion of Jesus, and endeavoured to set aside as myths and fictitious accretions all those details of the Gospel narrative which pointed to, and supported, doctrinal conclusions, the present work is devoted to establishing the historical truth of those details: the agony of Gethsemane, the Resurrection, the several Christophanies at various times

¹ Taking the Synoptics to have been completed from fifty-five to seventy-five years after the Crucifixion, and the Gospel of S. John in about 130 years after the same. This is the computation of those who maintain the mythic theory, on which we are commenting. It is evident that, in these dates, they have pushed the dates of composition to the very latest points of time that are possible, and far beyond what is *probable*.

and places until the Ascension. But beyond this, every incident and particular of the Passion is scrutinized, as it were, with a microscope, and with an excessive minuteness which sometimes tends to defeat itself. The object, however, is worthy of all praise, and the tone is pious and reverent. But we must think the author quite in error in the minimizing view which he takes of the Resurrection, and of its importance as an element in the faith of Christendom. Caspari's view, here criticized, that the Apostles made the Resurrection the cardinal fact of their preaching, and built upon it their Messianic proof, and their exhortations to faith and repentance, we hold to be no mistake, but a fact easily verifiable. The work, however, will be profitable to every theologian.

L'Avesta, Zoroastre et le Mazdéisme. Par ABEL HOVELACQUE. 8vo. (Paris : Maisonneuve, 1880.)

THE religious and metaphysical doctrines connected with the name of Zoroaster do not form an isolated fact in the history of mankind. They were gradually prepared by anterior teaching, and they were influenced to a considerable degree by Semitism, while in their turn they left distinct traces upon the other systems by which they were surrounded. Then what has become of modern Zoroastrism, and what are the historical causes which have reduced its present adherents to a mere handful? All these points are fraught with interest. M. Abel Hovelacque, however, leaves them unnoticed, and confines himself strictly to an investigation of the following questions: What are the contents of the Avesta? What explanation does it offer of the various cosmological, metaphysical, and ethical problems which have always engaged the thoughts of mankind? Finally, to what epoch must we ascribe the composition and diffusion of the Zend texts, such as we possess them now?

The first portion of M. Hovelacque's volume is taken up by an account of the views entertained on Zoroaster previous to the discoveries of Anquetil-Duperron (part 1), the labours of that well-known Frenchman and his contemporaries (part 2), the researches of Eugène Burnouf, and the various systems put forth from time to time for the interpretation of the *Avesta* (part 3). Mr. Haug, in his *Essays* (Bombay, 1862), endorsing an opinion generally admitted, says, 'The first who attempted to give a complete description of the doctrine of the Magi was the celebrated Oxford scholar, Hyde.' In opposition to this theory, M. Hovelacque maintains the prior claims of Barnabé Brisson, a distinguished French magistrate of the sixteenth century, author of a work entitled *De Regio Persarum Principatu libri tres*, which was published in Paris in 1590. The second division of this volume, devoted to the subject which occupies us here (*liber ii., quo de religione moribus institutisque Persarum tractatur*), is especially interesting, and shows on the part of Brisson an extraordinary amount of careful reading. When we come to Anquetil-Duperron, we have to notice, as a matter of course, the unjustifiable attacks directed against him by Sir William Jones: attacks carried on with an amount of bitterness and spite which are fortunately of very rare occurrence

in the annals of literary controversy. M. Eugène Burnouf next comes under consideration; and finally M. Hovelacque gives us a remarkably complete and accurate description of all the recent works treating of Zend grammar, literature, and philosophy, containing more particularly the different systems of interpretation proposed for the sacred books of the Parsees. What those books really are is a question of great importance, and, whilst discussing it, we come to the main body of M. Hovelacque's work. There seems little doubt that many of the treatises of which the *Avesta* was originally composed have been lost; nay, a legend exists to the effect that Alexander the Great ordered the destruction of all the Parsee books which did not treat of medicine and astronomy; but without admitting what seems to us an utterly untenable hypothesis, we are still warranted in supposing that a very considerable proportion of the sacred literature of the Parsees is now wanting, owing to several causes, the principal of which, together with the conquest of Alexander, were the domination of the Arsacides and that of the Arabs. One thing is certain, namely, that the texts we now possess under the name of *Avesta* are: (1) the three books of the *Vendidad*, (2) the *Visperad*, (3) the *Yagna*, (4) the *Yasts* or *Yests* of what is called the smaller *Avesta* (*Khorda-Avesta*). Such are the documents from which M. Hovelacque has gathered the account he gives us of the religion of the Parsees, their mythology, their cosmology, and their ethical system.

Whenever our author confines himself to the statement of facts, his accuracy is, generally speaking, beyond a doubt; but the conclusions he draws from these facts are, on the other hand, very often deplorably wrong, because he allows himself to be biased by his anti-Christian views, and by his entire misconception of the scope and character of Divine revelation. For instance, examining the principle of dualism, which, according to him, is at the bottom of Mazdeism, he lays great stress upon the fact that both Bayle¹ and Diderot² declare that the theory of the two conflicting elements or impersonations of good and evil is the only reasonable solution of the origin and existence of sin; he then goes on to say, that 'en dehors de l'expérience scientifique et désintéressée par laquelle la distinction de l'utile et du nuisible est purement relative, on ne peut repousser la conception des deux principes qu'à l'aide d'une croyance aveugle.' This essentially false notion of morality invalidates at once all that M. Hovelacque has to tell us, not only about religion in general, but about our relations with our fellow-creatures; we may add, further, that many *savants*, whose opinion is of the weightiest character, have, after careful study, come to the conclusion that monotheism is really the groundwork of Zoroaster's religious teaching. M. Haug says, plainly,³ 'The leading idea of his (Zoroaster's) theology was monotheism;' and although this monotheistic conception may be imperfectly and obscurely stated in the *Bundehesh*, yet

¹ *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique*, articles 'Manichéens' and 'Pauliciens.'

² *Encyclopédie*, article 'Manichéens.'

³ *Essays*, p. 255.

there it is. M. Hovelacque is particularly bitter against the *revealed* character of the Mazdean law, and, taking the opportunity thus offered, he denounces the immoral features of all revelation whatsoever, falling into the common error of the adversaries of Christianity, and including in his condemnation of all theological teaching S. Paul, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Charlier de Gerson, and Zoroaster. One error, he continues, leads to another; revelation and creation are two correlative doctrines, and the idea of creation once admitted, the superiority of man over the rest of created beings follows as a matter of course. In spite of these serious blots, M. Hovelacque feels grateful to the Mazdeans for not having, like the Jews and the Christians, ascribed to 'a venerable deity' the origin of evil and of the vicissitudes to which man is subjected. He also contrasts favourably their love of work with the communistic proclivities of the Semites, and he concludes by saying, that although they were guilty of the fault of introducing Deism into their code of morality, so far as a primitive revelation is concerned, they were nevertheless humane, and above all staunch champions of work, 'which alone imparts to man a sense of his true dignity.'

We have thus endeavoured to give to our readers an idea of M. Hovelacque's work, and we can only express, in conclusion, our sincere regret that the religious and philosophical results at which the author has arrived detract so much from the unquestionable merits of a volume which contains the fullest account we have of Zoroaster and of the *Avesta*.

Guillaume d'Auvergne, évêque de Paris (1228-1249), sa vie et ses ouvrages. Par NOËL VALOIS. 8vo. (Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1880.)

THE new work for which we are indebted to M. Noël Valois is an excellent specimen of those monographs which French students compose with a view of obtaining the doctor's degree in the University. It would have been impossible to select a better subject, or one affording greater scope for remarks on the state of the mediæval Church, and on the character of mediæval philosophy. Guillaume d'Auvergne was one of the leading personages during the thirteenth century, and whether we consider him as a prelate or a philosopher, an administrator or a theologian, he equally deserves our attention. Such being the case, it is a matter of regret that so little information has reached us on the early years of Guillaume d'Auvergne. Historians who have a leaning towards the marvellous and the legendary can indeed consult the anecdotes of Etienne de Bourbon or Vincent de Beauvais' *Speculum*; but beyond the fact that the future Bishop of Paris belonged by his birth to the province of Auvergne, and that he came from the neighbourhood of Aurillac, we know nothing certain about him till the year 1228, when we find him elected to the most important see in the kingdom, and thus called upon to take a leading part in the events of his time.

The first section of the book we are now reviewing comprises a very minute account of the prelate's episcopal career, and M. Noël

Valois takes the opportunity of giving some particulars on the system of elections which obtained in those days, the intervention of the Pope, the rights and privileges enjoyed by the capitular bodies, the episcopal jurisdiction, &c. &c. All these facts, gathered from a number of official documents, both published and also hitherto *inédits*, are related in a clear and animated style, and M. Valois has perfectly succeeded in proving that the utmost accuracy is consistent with artistic composition. The chapter on the plurality of benefices specially commends itself to the reader's notice. From the instances quoted by the author, it is quite clear that the most scandalous abuses were tolerated under various pretences towards the beginning of the thirteenth century, and although the crying sin we are now alluding to had previously been strongly and repeatedly condemned by the decisions of various Councils (Poitiers, 1070 and 1100; Clermont and Piacentia, 1095; London, 1125 and 1127; Lateran, 1179), a thorough change in this respect had unfortunately taken place, and the discipline of the Church was gradually losing its original character. We must refer the reader to the third chapter of M. Valois' book for full and conclusive evidence on this topic, and merely add here that Guillaume d'Auvergne, in his determined and persevering endeavours to put down a monstrous evil, within at any rate the limits of his diocese, was supported by the well-known disinterestedness which he had often exhibited, and by the unimpeachable integrity of his personal character. Not satisfied with active intervention, and with the constant carrying out of his episcopal rights, he also took up the pen in favour of ecclesiastical discipline, and his treatise *De Collatione Beneficiorum* is severe enough to satisfy, says M. Valois, 'les plus rigides réformateurs.'

Another incident which should not be forgotten in the life of Gulielmus Arvernus is the famous rebellion of Paris University against the police enactments of the Provost of the city, backed by the express orders of the Queen Regent, Blanche of Castile. This event led, as is well known, to the introduction of the Dominicans as Divinity lecturers, and was the origin of a very acrimonious dispute between the champions of the rights and privileges of the Paris *alma mater* and the representative of the monastic orders. Whether the Dominicans obtained this first lectureship in consequence of the disturbances which ended in the expulsion of the original professors, or whether they had already gained a footing within the University when the scholastic *émeute* broke out, is the point still *sub judice*. Du Boulay, Crevier, and Daunou are very naturally in favour of the former opinion, whilst Echard and, quite recently, Father Danzas (*Études sur les temps primitifs de l'Ordre de Saint Dominique*, Paris, 1875) maintain the latter. M. Valois adheres to the secular side, but he distinctly acknowledges that the Bishop should be regarded as a thorough benefactor of scientific education for having 'enrolled under the standard of the University the young army of Saint Dominic, and having opened the breach through which Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas made their way a little later on.'

We must now come to the second division of the work before us.

the one which treats of Gulielmus Arvernus as a divine, a metaphysician, and a thinker. M. Valois gives us in the first place a complete list of all the prelate's writings, printed and unpublished, authentic, doubtful, or certainly spurious, and after showing that his treatise *de Universo*, taken in connexion with several other dissertations, constitutes a kind of *summa theologica*, he devotes a series of chapters to the views of Guillaume d'Auvergne on the various points of metaphysics, theodicy, logic, ontology, and material science. There are few authors about whom so great a difference of opinion exists as the distinguished prelate we have been noticing. Dom Ceillier, Ellies Dupin, Gabriel Naudé treat him favourably, and he was evidently a favourite at Port Royal. On the contrary, M. Daunou, without having taken the trouble of studying him, condemns him in the severest manner, evidently rejoicing at the opportunity of crushing (as he thought) one of the leading champions of superstition and of monastic intolerance. But Daunou judged the mediæval ages from the standpoint of the French eighteenth-century *philosophe*, and his criticism is absolutely worthless. It was reserved for the erudition of our own day to award to Guillaume d'Auvergne his proper place as an enlightened and moderate Platonist on the roll of metaphysicians, and following in the path opened by Messrs. Jourdain, Haureau, Lecoy de la Marche, Stöcke and Werner, M. Valois has accomplished a work of rehabilitation which cannot be commended too much. His volume is completed by an appendix of *pièces justificatives* and a very full index.

Du Sentiment religieux en Grèce d'Homère à Eschyle. Par JULES GIRARD, Membre de l'Institut. 12mo. (Paris and London: Hachette and Co.)

THE object which M. Jules Girard had in view whilst writing his new volume was to illustrate the history of religious belief amongst the ancient Greeks, and to show from the works of Hesiod, Homer, and Æschylus how they endeavoured to solve the problem of man's destiny in this world and of his relations with the Deity. According to M. Girard, the fundamental idea which characterizes the religion of the Homeric epics and of Hesiod's poems is that of a universal harmony prevailing both through the laws of the universe and the existence of man. This idea leads the Hellenic mind above the naturalism of the Hindus to an intelligent system of monotheism. It may be observed, our author adds, that the theology of the ancient Greeks arrived at once to the religious conclusions with which it has always been identified, and their attempted solution of the contradictions which make man's rôle here below so singular a problem has very little varied.

After studying from this point of view the old Greek poets, M. Girard devotes the second part of his volume to an inquiry into the influence exercised by Orphic ideas over the development and progress of religious doctrines. If we read Homer carefully, we cannot help noticing the worse than imperfect system he has about merit and demerit, punishment and reward, vice and virtue. Morality, as our

author remarks, is absorbed by mythology, and whilst murder and theft remain unpunished, offences against the gods alone are terribly expiated, as in the case of Tityos, Tantalos, and Sisyphos. The first step in the way of progress was to be made by Pindar; the next was taken by the authors of the Orphic poems. When we survey nature, and man, who holds his place in the vast compass of nature, we cannot help being struck by the fact that everywhere good is mixed with bad, light with darkness, happiness with suffering, life with death. The peculiar feature, however, of man's constitution is that, whilst all other beings tend to realize their full existence, and aspire after the attainment of material order, he alone, in accordance with his quality as a moral being, longs for supra-sensible felicity, and distinctly sees that virtue is the object he should always keep in sight. Hence the whole system of what M. Girard designates under the name of *Orphism*, which, through the assistance of various myths, such as the one of the Titans and Bacchus, inculcated the strict necessity on the part of man to shake off the low elements of his nature, and, on the other hand, to purify himself more and more through intimate connexion with the Deity. The doctrine of expiation forms one of the most salient points in this scheme of theology, the one which appeals principally to our Christian feelings. It is impossible to study the tenets of the Orphic philosophers in the rare *testimonia* we have of their theories, it is impossible to read attentively the splendid productions of Æschylus and Sophocles, without seeing everywhere the great tenet of retribution plainly set forth as the moral lever which uplifts us, the master key to the problem of our destiny. Such is the last stage in the religious progress accomplished by the old Greek writers, and which finds its complete expression in Æschylus. As M. Girard very aptly remarks, the longing for harmony was always the leading passion of Hellenic thought, but how that harmony should be brought about, how, in short, the contradictions with which our world is full should be explained and reconciled, no one successfully ascertained before the immortal author of the *Prometheus* and the *Agamemnon*.

The third book of M. Girard's volume is entirely taken up by a discussion of the Greek tragedy examined from the religious point of view. It is full of real interest, and shows on the part of the author a thorough acquaintance not only with classic literature, but with the development of ancient philosophy and theodicy. The whole work is one of the best contributions to the history of religion which we have seen for a long time.

Notice sur les Manuscrits des Poésies de S. Paulin de Nole, suivie d'Observations sur le Texte. Par EMILE CHASTELAIN. 8vo. (Paris: Thorin.)

THE students of Christian antiquity will be glad to hear that a MS. copy of the poems of S. Paulinus Nolensis has been discovered in the Vatican library, and its *varia lectiones* edited by M. Emile Chastelain in the *Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises de Rome et d'Athènes*. We noticed a little while ago in this review a new edition

of Sidonius Apollinaris; we hope to have to record before long that Ausonius and Paulinus Nolensis have also been deemed worthy of engaging the attention of some competent scholar. In the meanwhile the *brochure* we are now describing will be found most useful to the future annotator of the Bishop of Nola, for it contains a large amount of critical matter which had never yet seen the light. Not only has M. Chastelain examined the Vatican MS., he has also consulted several other *codices* preserved in the public libraries of Rome, Milan, Bologna, Paris (no less than five), S. Petersburg, Brussels, Munich, and S. Gall. His next step has been to discuss the relative value of these authorities, and to take this critical inquiry as the basis of a classification. Finally, M. Chastelain has made some remarks on various passages which had hitherto been imperfectly understood; he weighs attentively the merit of conflicting readings, and does his best to establish a really accurate text. It is a remarkable fact that the last good edition of the works of Paulinus Nolensis dates as far back as 1685; it was undertaken in Paris by Lebrun des Marettes, and reprinted verbatim in 1736 by Muratori, with the addition of four short poems which the Italian critic had discovered in a Milan MS. The Vatican *codex*, which forms the principal subject of M. Chastelain's *brochure*, is, so far as we can judge, rather incorrect, but its importance fully justifies the labour bestowed upon it by our young *savant*.

The Gifts of Civilization; and other Sermons and Lectures delivered at Oxford and at S. Paul's. By R. W. CHURCH, M.A., D.C.L., Dean of S. Paul's. New Edition. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1880.)

THIS volume consists, first, of four Sermons, preached before the University of Oxford, on subjects bearing more or less upon the interdependence of Religion and Civilization; second, of two Lectures, delivered in S. Paul's Cathedral in 1872, on 'Civilization before and after Christianity'; third, of a course of *three* Lectures, dated 1873, 'On some Influences of Christianity upon National Character'; and fourth, of two Lectures on 'The Sacred Poetry of Early Religions.' Consisting therefore of several parts, written on different though allied subjects, and not treated on an uniform scale, it cannot be looked upon as one whole, but as a series of sketches, mutually illustrative, indeed, but not following in any logical order.

Perhaps most striking of all, because they bear most closely upon the special intellectual dangers of this age, are the two Lectures on 'Civilization before and after Christianity.' The Dean shows his readers, in the former of these, a really vivid picture of Roman civilization, with its considerable reach of thought and large practical achievements. He does not detract from it in order to heighten the effect of his description of Christian civilization, which follows. He touches the bright lights of that magnificent state and marked national character with a willing hand and ungrudgingly. With great accuracy, as we conceive, he puts the root of Roman greatness in its possession and tenacious grasp and acting upon, of two great principles: the one, 'that the work of the community should be governed by

law ; the other, that public interest and public claims were paramount to all others.'

Where these characteristics exist, it must not doubt be allowed that 'you have an essential feature of high civilization.' An essential feature, certainly, a *sine quâ non*, a necessary prerequisite ; because without respect for law there can be no organization, and without organization a state of civilization is impossible ; indeed, to say that a state is civilized is really to say that it is more or less perfectly organized. But there are civilizations of different types : in some the material ideal dominates over the spiritual ; in others, *vice versa*. We take it that the Commonwealth of Athens was, on the whole, a *πολιτεία* of a distinctly higher type than the gigantic Roman State which strangled it with one grasp.

But such a motive was adequate to produce, and did in fact produce for ages, great citizens, men in whom blazed 'the sense of public interest, the fire of public duty, the public spirit which accepted without complaint trouble and sacrifice.' These were not inconsiderable results. Yet it must be said that they cover but a small part of the field of human action, and little, indeed, of the wide and tossing sea of human passion and feeling. This motive could not therefore control and train the entire nature of any man ; and it is probable that, while Roman citizens forgot not their duty to the state which they served, they forgot very many other duties. The cruelty of Cato, the tergiversation of Cicero, the profligacy of C. Cæsar, co-existed with a spotless reputation towards the public. But, says the Dean very truly, 'Roman civilization was only true as long as men were true to their principles ; but it had no root beyond their personal characters and traditions and customary life : and when these failed it had nothing else to appeal to—it had no power and spring of recovery.'

And herein lies the great contrast between it and the later—the post-Christian—civilization, in that this latter has always had a reserve of spiritual force, which held it back from final and irretrievable ruin, and brought about a 'new departure' in history. Post-Christian society has been at certain times and places to the full as corrupt as that which preceded the Christian era ; but the repeated casting out of the *virus* showed the superior vitality, in a spiritual sense, of the later civilization.

This, the characteristic difference between the two, is elaborated into its details by the Dean with an intimate knowledge of his subject, and a happiness of phrase all his own, and to which we are now no strangers. We must not linger longer upon his pages ; yet we will give, as a specimen of happy and accurate description, the lines in which he has characterized the civil law :—

'Roman law was no collection of a certain number of vague constitutional articles ; it was no cast-iron code of unchanging rules ; but it was a real, living, expansive system, developing vigorously as the nation grew, co-extensive with the nation's wants in its range and applicability, searching and self-enforcing in its work, a system which the people used and relied upon in their private as much as in their public affairs. And

so grew up, slowly and naturally through many centuries, in the way familiar to us in our law, the imposing and elaborate system of scientific jurisprudence which the Romans, when they passed away, bequeathed to the coming world: the great collections of Theodosius and Justinian, in which are gathered the experiences of many ages of Roman society, played upon, illuminated, analysed, arranged, by a succession of judicial intellects of vast power and consummate accomplishments; that as yet unequalled monument of legal learning, comprehensive method and fruitfulness in practical utility which, under the name of Civil Law, has been the great example to the world of what law may be; which has governed the jurisprudence of great part of Europe, which has influenced in no slight degree our own jealous and hostile English traditions, and will probably influence them still more'—(p. 165).

Personal Recollections of British Burmah and its Church Mission Work in 1878-79. By the Right Rev. J. H. TITCOMB, D.D., first Bishop of Rangoon. (London: Wells Gardner, Darton, and Co., 1880.)

It is an ominous thing for a Colonial Bishop newly appointed, when he has been at his diocese but a year, to come home and stay at home, and instead of doing the work he was consecrated to do, to write a book. To be sure, it is not a very big book. Twelve months' 'Recollections' could hardly be very lengthy. Nor do we wish to find any particular fault with the volume itself. The Bishop, at all events, has found out where there is mission work that needs to be done. We cannot say that it appears to us to breathe a true missionary spirit; but that may be merely our individual opinion.

It seems that the first thing the Bishop did after arriving was to assemble the (four) clergy of Rangoon 'in private conference,' in order to 'ascertain from them the exact position of ecclesiastical affairs, and consult their views upon matters of the most pressing importance.' It is usual to consult *people*, and not 'views,' by-the-by; but that is of no consequence. We do not learn what these matters of 'most pressing importance' were, or how they fared; but we find that, at all events, the Bishop took 'this early opportunity of explaining my own Church principles,' and so on, 'all of which was most kindly received; and I may add that ever since not one word of any serious misunderstanding has arisen between myself and the clergy of the diocese.' We should hope it had not, indeed; and we, for our part, should have thought it unnecessary to volunteer such a statement. The sequel, too, as narrated by the Bishop, is decidedly curious. It was proposed that a new church would be a good thing. Accordingly, a public meeting was called in the Chief Commissioner's 'banqueting-hall,' to consider the subject. 'The attendance was good; the spirit of the meeting was excellent; resolutions approving the object were passed; and a large committee was formed for the purpose of'—collecting subscriptions, thinks the reader. No; but of 'approaching Government on the subject.' And as the Government of India refused to make the slightest grant in aid of an object which, however good, it no doubt considered ought to be first taken in hand by the European inhabitants themselves, the project of

church-building, notwithstanding the 'good attendance' and the 'excellent spirit,' fell at once hopelessly to the ground!

We think, however, the volume may be of use in some quarters, as giving a brief and popular account of the state of the diocese, which is not well known. And we hope that the Bishop will soon have accumulated a new and larger stock of 'Recollections'—*on the spot*.

History of Judah and Israel, from the Reign of Solomon to the Reign of Ahab. By ALFRED EDERSHEIM, D.D., Ph.D. (London: Religious Tract Society.)

DR. EDERSHEIM'S little books, in spite of their faults of method and style, throw frequent and valuable illustrations on the narratives of the Bible by the writer's intimate knowledge of Hebrew literature and customs; and the present volume, though there is no special remark to be made upon it, may be noted as a useful book, to be purchased for the school library or for young people.

Eutropia: or, How to Find a Way out of Darkness and Doubt into Light and Certainty. By the Rev. FATHER PIUS DEVINE, Passionist. (London: Burns and Oates, 1880.)

'THE half educated,' says the Rev. Father Pius Devine, 'know not how to reason. Sophisms stand them in place of arguments.'¹ Acting upon this truism, the Rev. Father has furnished a supply of sophisms in the volume named above, which is intended for the assistance of other proselytizing Romish priests, and to be placed, when prudence allows, in the hands 'of the better instructed, even before their conversion.'² We do not say that all his arguments are sophisms. We recognize the effectiveness of well-tried weapons drawn from the common armoury of all who believe in a visible Christian Church. But sophism, assumption, and even downright ignorance furnish other *quasi* arguments, fitted only to convince those 'who know not how to reason.'

For an example of sophistical reasoning see the author's method in regard to Popes who are acknowledged to have been in error. 'If some one Pope here or there did not exercise it (infallibility sc.) carefully, there is rather a confirmation of his possession of it even in the fact of the objection. A man cannot abuse what he has not got.'³ Thus the interpretation of our Blessed Lord's words to S. Peter, according to which He is maintained to have conferred official immunity from error upon all occupants of the See of Rome (though their succession from the Apostle is more than doubtful), is here declared to be partly established by the fact that some of them were *not* free from error.

Look at another argument in connexion with infallibility. The Rev. Father is concerned to show that an infallible teacher of Divine truth has existed among men from the beginning. We pass over his deduction of the gift from Adam downwards, and the difficulties

¹ *Eutropia*, p. 42.

² *Ibid.* Preface, p. x.

³ *Ibid.* p. 332.

which he meets with in his course ; such as 'an interregnum (where somebody must have possessed authority, although there is no record of it), between the death of Ephraim and the call of Moses, of 102 years,' and we come to Caiaphas, or, as our author prefers, Caiphaz. Caiphaz, then, being high-priest, was the official expounder of Divine truth, and was gifted with infallibility. He could not err in any sentence or decree which he pronounced in his official capacity as the head of the Jewish Church. The theory works at first sight plausibly by the side of the words of the Evangelist : 'This spake he, not of himself ; but being high-priest that year, he prophesied,' &c. ;¹ though there is obviously a very broad distinction between the involuntary prophecy uttered by the high-priest and the definitions which Popes have pronounced. But the most formidable difficulty arises when we read that 'the high-priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy.' The solution propounded for this difficulty is that the high-priest, in condemning our Lord to death, 'did not oppose the law ; on the contrary, he fulfilled it, and involuntarily completed it ; for, by means of his sentence, he caused the true Lamb . . . to be offered.'² We need not comment upon the shocking audacity of such a method of supporting a weak theory. S. Peter himself speaks again and again with horror of the act which we are now told infallibility prompted : 'Ye delivered up' (Jesus), 'and denied Him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let Him go. But ye denied the Holy One and the Just . . . and killed the Prince of Life.' Yet S. Peter offers *some* palliation for the crime ; though not such palliation as may comport with infallibility. 'And now, brethren, I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers.'³

It would occupy too much space to dwell upon the daring assumption that the Roman Church is the home of the most distinguished intellects of the world, of the most accurate scholarship, the most exalted literary power, the most advanced science ; which ignores Chaucer's sympathy with præ-Reformation reformers, and which asserts that Shakspeare lived in (Roman) Catholic times :⁴ or upon the singular view of duty according to which it appears to be wrong to 'refuse all alms to a beggar,'⁵ but right for 'the Church' to transfer to congenial work a young person's 'affection which might be wasted on a selfish father.'⁶ These and many other points invite comment. But we pass to the evidence which the author supplies that in the interpretation of the Greek Testament he is only fitted to be a blind leader of the blind.

'It is sad,' the author says, 'to see people attempt to build their faith on the Scriptures, and at the same time know nothing about the languages in which they were written, or the meaning which those

¹ John xi. 51, 52. See, however, what the high-priest actually said, vv. 49, 50.

² *Eutropia*, p. 189.

³ Acts iii. 13-17. See also i. 22-24, and iv. 10, 11.

⁴ Shakspeare was born after Elizabeth's accession.

⁵ *Eutropia*, chap. xiii.

⁶ *Ibid.* chap. xlvii.

languages had to those who spoke them.¹ The only point here on which we shall remark is the singularly bad grace with which this lamentation comes from the author of this book. His own knowledge of Greek is conspicuous by its absence. We make the charge deliberately and we are bound to prove it.

The first blunder that we cite is the form *Ἀπωστέλλος*,² as the Greek for Apostle, instead of *Ἀπόστολος*. On the following page we are told that *Μετανοεῖν* came to mean penance.³ We make no remark upon the translation, but there is evidently a confusion between the infinitive *μετανοεῖν* and the substantive *μετάνοια*. *Ἀπωστέλλος* looks very much like the hardy attempt to form the Greek word in the confidence of ignorance by one who disdained the necessity of verifying his word-building since he *knew* that the word required was derived from *ἀποστέλλω*. A very slight knowledge of the laws of derivation in Greek would have rendered such a blunder as *Ἀπωστέλλος* impossible.

There is, of course, the chance that in both the instances mentioned the fault is originally the printer's, and that the blame attaching to the author is only that of carelessness, or haste, in correcting his proofs. *Humanum est errare*; and *hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim*. On such evidence alone it would be harsh and unfair to pronounce an unfavourable judgment. Unfortunately for the author he has provided conclusive proof against himself. Like other defenders of Mariolatry, he finds it an awkward fact, that our Blessed Lord is reported by S. John to have addressed His Virgin Mother in the words, *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, γύναι*, rendered in our version, 'Woman; what have I to do with thee?'³ We cannot examine in detail his ignorant and nonsensical rendering of our Lord's question, about the meaning of which no one moderately acquainted with Greek has any doubt, and which 'all expositors of the early Church have allowed, even by the confession of the Romanists themselves,' to convey 'more or less of reproof and repulse.'⁴ We pass at once to the crowning blunder into which he is betrayed when attempting to support by classical example his assertion, 'The expression, *τί (sic) ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί (sic)*, means a separation, a good-bye, or, otherwise, is an expression of great respect in the Greek language.'

'Epictetus,' he tells us, 'addresses a great friend in terms of gratitude :

Τὶ ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ ἄνθρωπε; ἄρκεῖ ἐμοὶ τὰ ἐμὰ κάκα.'—

'What is to me and to thee, man? Thou keepest all my evils from me.'⁵

¹ *Eutropia*, pp. 323, 324.

² *Ibid.* p. 276.

³ S. John ii. 4.

⁴ *Notes on the Miracles*, Archbishop Trench (5th edition, 1856), pp. 101, 102.

⁵ *Eutropia*, pp. 321, 322. The author does not tell us where to find this expression of Epictetus's gratitude. He says, however, in a note, 'Aulus Gellius quotes lib. i. *Noctes Atticæ*,' which is precisely as if one were to say 'Milton quotes *Paradise Lost*.' We do indeed find in Aulus Gellius's *Noctes Atticæ*, lib. i. cap. iii., the following words : 'Τί

We pass by the two blunders in accentuation in the first and last words of this quotation. The chief point to notice is that the Rev. Father Pius Devine has misunderstood the whole passage, and consequently has mistranslated it, as a fifth-form school-boy would be ashamed of doing. It does not need vast erudition to see that the words mean—

‘What have I to do with you, man? My own troubles are sufficient for me.’

Thus the witness cited to speak in our author's favour has given the most damning evidence against him. What would a master at one of our public schools say to a boy who distinguished himself as he has done? Probably this: ‘The verb is accented by you, my boy, in an impossible manner. Let us first correct this to ἀρκεί. Now what led you to translate ἀρκεί ἐμοὶ τὰ ἐμὰ κακά, “thou keepest all my evils from me”? I will tell you. You were certain that ἀρκεί is singular, and τὰ ἐμὰ κακά, plural, and in regard to both, you were quite right. Then you rightly guessed, from your knowledge of the Latin *arceo*, that the Greek ἀρκέω might mean “to keep off,” “to ward off.” It has not, however, this meaning always, and your knowledge of Latin has misled you here. Next, you jumped to the conclusion (boys are so careless) that ἀρκεί must be second person singular, because a *thou* had been addressed in the first half of the line, and you did not see who else but “thou” was provided for performing the action, “the keeping off evils,” which the words so temptingly but wrongly suggested to your mind. In fact you could not see any other possible way than yours of construing the sentence. Remember, then, for the future, that, in Greek, a plural nominative neuter may go with a singular verb, as it does here. It is a curious but a common idiom. Coleridge explained it by saying that to the Greek mind “multeity” and “plurality” were not the same thing: there might be multeity in things inanimate, or in things only irrational (as sheep); to be “plural” was characteristic of things in a higher order altogether.’

But we must make an end. Our account, however, of the Rev. Father's *exegesis* would be incomplete, did we not add that, if illiterate argument will not serve his purpose, he has another and a readier way. If the phrase addressed to the Blessed Virgin cannot be twisted to suit him, he ‘would rather believe that the Scriptures were interpolated than that our Lord used it.’¹ Nay, a more effective weapon than even the eraser is at hand. The (Roman) Catholic ‘feels more inclined to shoot the man that would disparage her than to spend an argument on so worthless and disgusting a monster.’²

ἡμῖν καὶ σοὶ, ἀνθρώπε; ἀπολλύμεθα καὶ σὺ ἐλθὼν παίζεις. ‘What have we to do with you, man? We are perishing and you come and make fun.’ But this, like the passage in the text, is dead against our author's theory. So also is his quotation from *Anacreon*, and that from *Ovid*, with which he seeks to illustrate his view. The mistranslation of the latter shows his Latin scholarship to be about on a par with his Greek. Moreover *Ovid* did not write the words quoted ‘in going into exile,’ but after he had begun to feel the misery of it.

¹ *Eutropia*, p. 323.

² *Ibid.*, p. 324. From what the author says in this page he clearly

Nile Gleanings: Concerning the Ethnology, History, and Art of Ancient Egypt, as Revealed. By VILLIERS STUART OF DROMANA. With fifty-eight Coloured and Outline Plates, from Sketches and Impressions taken from the Monuments. (London: John Murray, 1879.)

CAN there be anything new to be said about Egypt? is the thought which rises naturally in the minds of most readers, as they open this handsome volume. Mr. Villiers Stuart is himself so sensible of this feeling, that the first words of his Preface are devoted to a protest against the idea that 'nothing more is left to say' about Egypt, and to assure his readers that 'much still remains to be discovered there; much of what has been already discovered still remains to be described.' He has, however, shown this to be the case in a far more practical way, by embodying much new and remarkably interesting information in the volume before us.

He prefaces the account of his explorations by a chapter on the characteristics of Egyptian art, which will be found of great use in preparing the reader what to expect from the monuments, and what not to expect. He points out that the intention of their paintings and bas-reliefs was not to produce artistic masterpieces, but to record the succession of their sovereigns, the great actions of the kings and chiefs, and other historical events; while, in temples of private foundation, the family history is painted on the walls. They regarded painting and sculpture, in fact, as merely another means of writing, and took no more pains with the details than was necessary to make the meaning clear. 'I doubt,' he says, 'whether the idea of art for its own sake entered into an Egyptian's head at all.' The vast size of the surfaces to be treated is also to be remembered. They were required to cover whole acres of wall with painting; and these two facts abundantly account for the stiff conventionality of style constantly found. The author, while allowing this to be the case, excepts from the charge the *faces*, which are often beautifully drawn; and there are reigns, such as that of Sethi, during which this breathless haste of execution was not exacted, and in which therefore good and artistic work is found. The mention of Sethi reminds us of one of the respects in which Mr. Villiers Stuart's book takes an independent view of Egyptian history; we mean the great antiquity to which he throws it back. He is of opinion that it 'had its beginning at the enormously remote period of nearly 4000 years before the Christian era.' He is comparatively moderate in this computation, for Mariette Bey assigns 5234 B.C. as the date of Menes, and 4235 B.C. as the time when the Great Pyramid was built; while Brugsch Bey (vol. ii. p. 311) has fixed 4400 B.C. as the date of the teaches that all 'disparage Mary who will not believe that our Lord 'obeys her still, and that she commands in heaven,' which will include all who say, as we do, with Bishop Pearson, 'We cannot bear too reverend a regard unto the mother of our Lord, so long as we give her not that worship which is due unto the Lord himself. Let us keep the language of the primitive Church: "Let her be honoured and esteemed, let Him be worshipped and adored."'—*Exposition of the Creed*, art. iii.

former event, and *circa* 3700 B.C. for the latter. Mr. Villiers Stuart's dates, which, however, cannot be considered more than approximations, are :—

Foundation of the Egyptian Empire by Menes, 4124 B.C.

Date of the Great Pyramid, 3600 B.C.

These results are obtained in reliance on the tablet compiled by King Sethi, of the nineteenth dynasty, the father of Rameses the Great, which was discovered in the Temple of Abydos, in Upper Egypt. Mr. Stuart does not say by whom, but we think, by M. de Rougé. Of this tablet, by the aid of which most modern writers upon Egyptian chronology have corrected the lists given by Manetho, but with somewhat varying results, Mr. Villiers Stuart for the first time puts the actual hieroglyphs before the eyes of the European reader by a *facsimile* drawing. Unfortunately it excludes a large number of reigns of set purpose ; embracing *inter alia* the long period of altogether not less than 500 years (according to Manetho) during which Egypt was in the power of the Hyksos, or Shepherd Kings ; and this interval includes (as he points out) the entire time of the period of Abraham's visit and of Joseph's Egyptian career ; so that it throws no light upon the Biblical history. At the end of chapter xxxii., however, there is a table in which the author endeavours, with very fair success, to bring the results thus obtained to synchronize with the Mosaic chronology, reckoning backward from the well-ascertained date (B.C. 979) of the capture of Jerusalem by Shishak. He has, however, to take one liberty with the Bible chronology. He reduces the time during which Israel was governed by Judges from 450 to 391 years, justifying this by a reference to the expression of S. Paul in Acts xiii. 20, '*about* (ὥς) four hundred and fifty years.'

Mr. Villiers Stuart gives a very unfavourable account of the present condition of the antiquities of Egypt. They are fast perishing, he says : the slow ravages of time being indefinitely quickened by the ignorant rapacity of native collectors, who hope to make a profit by the sale of anything that is valuable to European visitors ; and who rifle the most carefully protected tombs in pursuit of their gain. In a great many passages of this work he notices instances of this having been done.

This desecration is not confined to tombs, but extends to the structure of the temples themselves. He mentions one case in particular in which a large fragment of the frieze of a temple was offered to him for sale by an Arab who had broken it off. Unlike collectors in general, Mr. Stuart's fear that he might be encouraging wanton pillage withheld him from completing the purchase. His dragoman gravely proposed that he should call up his boat's crew, bastinado the thief, and take the relic without payment : a course too Oriental in its character for an Englishman to be willing to follow. We can hardly, however, feel surprise at the prevalence of the practice, because it seems to be one of ancient date in the country. We learn from Brugsch Bey that as far back as B.C. 1130 there existed in Thebes a regularly organized thieves' society, formed for the secret opening and robbing of the tombs of the kings, in which even

persons of sacerdotal character took a part.—(*Egypt under the Pharaohs*, vol. ii. p. 182.)

It is not to be wondered at that Mr. Villiers Stuart's long researches among the records of this wonderful people should have been to greatly increase his respect for their capabilities of every kind. He wishes to derive Greek civilization from them through the Pelasgi, and Italian through the Etruscans, 'a branch of the Pelasgic family.' This is of course a mere guess; and it would certainly be a roundabout course for colonization to have taken, though we cannot deny that there is much to support it in the similarity of their art, the forms of pottery, of household furniture and implements, and such like.

We feel that we have only touched on a few of the many points of interesting inquiry arising out of the present work. The linguistic affinities indicated on pp. 278–280; the very interesting, though we think doubtful, traces of a belief in a resurrection from the dead current among the Egyptians of very early ages; not to speak of the remarkably powerful sketches of Cairo, and the working of Mohammedanism in modern Egypt, are each and all of unusual interest, and worthy of careful perusal. We can in all respects recommend the work as an intelligent, adequate, and even attractive essay on one of the most deeply engaging of all archæological inquiries.

Fénelon's Spiritual Letters, and other Devotional Works. (London: Rivingtons, 1880.)

SOME of our readers may be glad to hear that Messrs. Rivington have published in seven uniform little half-crown volumes, very suitable for presents, the devotional works that have appeared at intervals under the editorial care of the author of the *Life of S. Francis de Sales*. They are the *Spiritual Letters of Fénelon to men and women*, the *Spiritual Letters of S. Francis de Sales*, the *Spirit* of the last-named writer, and three anonymous treatises under the respective titles of the *Hidden Life of the Soul*, the *Light of the Conscience*, and *Self-Renunciation*.

Practical Reflections on every Verse of the Holy Gospels. By A CLERGYMAN. (London: Rivingtons, 1880.)

IT must surely be reckoned among the hopeful signs of Christendom, that so much of reverent study has of late years been bestowed upon the Holy Gospels. Even the ex-editor of the *Dublin Review*, who can hardly ever find a good word for the communion in which he was nurtured, is able to bestow some little praise upon the labours expended on this subject by such men as Mr. Greswell, Archbishop Trench, Dean Burgon, the lamented Isaac Williams, and others. We should like to mention, with these eminent writers, the late Mr. Anderdon, author of *The Messiah*, a *Life of Our Lord*, published anonymously some years since by Mr. Murray; a book far less known than it deserves to be. Dr. Ward claims for Father Coleridge (an *alumnus* of Eton and Oxford) a higher place than any of the above-named commentators. Without being able to assent to this

judgment, we can gladly recognize the great reverence and thoughtfulness, the learning and the suggestiveness of such portions of Father Coleridge's work as we have seen (namely the two volumes on the Public Life of Our Lord), and can observe with pleasure the comparative absence of controversial matter.

The volume before us will, we believe, prove a most valuable and welcome addition to our means of studying the Gospels. Though freely supplemented from other sources, it is based upon the work of a famous Gallican and Jansenist divine, Father Quesnel; but we have not observed any prominent place given to the quasi-Calvinistic elements in the teaching of that which drew upon it the condemnation of the Papal authorities.

These 'Practical Reflections' will in no wise interfere with the reader's appreciation and enjoyment of consecutive biographies of Our Lord's life on earth: nay, we venture to think that they will dispose us to profit by them all the more. It is also a great advantage, especially for busy persons, who have less leisure for study than they could wish, that they can without difficulty select just so much or so little as may serve the opportunity, without prejudice to their apprehension of the general sense.

A specimen or two, selected almost at random, will make our meaning clearer than any explanation.

Here is the brief comment upon S. Mark xiv. 11, the final words of the verse being: 'And he sought how he might conveniently betray him:—

'The opportunity came next day. If we resolve to do the devil's work the occasion will not be long coming. Judas had forgotten all his Master's glory, all His kindness, all the great powers which He himself had been intrusted with; covetousness and disappointment and a fancied affront had driven all those happy memories out of his mind, and left only this hateful purpose of betraying Him.'

We have here a warning not devoid of awe. The fifteenth verse of the same chapter is dwelt upon in such wise as to direct our thoughts into a more hopeful channel:—

'And he will show you a large upper room furnished and prepared; there make ready for us.'

'This room is the believer's heart. It should be large, that is, full of charity; and raised up above the stir of the world and sin; and furnished with humility and prayer and other needful graces. Lord make my heart such, and come Thou to dwell in it. How can it be worthy unless Thy saving presence make it so?'

We believe that many of our readers will be grateful to us for having called their attention to a book so excellently adapted to fill up a gap in our devotional literature.

Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Fredericton. Delivered at his Visitation, held on June 30, 1880, by JOHN, Lord Bishop of Fredericton and Metropolitan of Canada. Published at the request of the Synod. (St. John, N.B., 1880.)

THIS is a most admirable Charge, simple, plain-spoken, and fearless.

The aged Metropolitan's bold utterance as to the question of legalizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister and with the brother of a deceased husband, for which a Bill was introduced into the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, deserves our highest admiration and gratitude. The Synod has shown its reverence for the Bishop by empowering him to nominate a *coadjutor cum jure successionis*.

The Preacher's Pocket: a Packet of Sermons. By the Rev. S. BARING-GOULD, M.A. (London : Skeffington and Son, 1880.)

UNDER this somewhat affected title will be found some twenty sermons, marked by the ability which distinguishes all Mr. Baring-Gould's writings. They are intended for an educated audience, in order 'to set them thinking.' Accordingly they are rather daring and even flippant ; abounding with quotations from Shakspeare, and with references to the questions of the day. It seems to be an experiment to show that Mr. Haweis is not to continue to hold a monopoly of 'leading article' preaching, and that a sounder theology than his may be advocated in sensational addresses from the pulpit.

Sermons for the Christian Year. Vol. XI. By the late Rev. JOHN KEBLE. (Oxford and London : James Parker and Co., 1880.)

FORTY-FOUR more of Mr. Keble's most spiritual sermons will be welcome to all readers. The present forms volume XI. of the series, and we rather suppose, though we do not know, that the public has now had nearly all which their revered writer left behind him. They are of somewhat more *occasional* character than those contained in previous volumes, comprising six sermons for Missions, with others for Consecrations, Church Restorations, and such like. Mr. Keble had not the oratorical brilliance on such occasions of some preachers ; but he had somewhat better than brilliance—a lofty simplicity, which gradually awes the reader, and a kindly sweetness which wins him. We are glad to receive another volume of his discourses.

The New Burials Act. What it does and what it does not do, containing a Short Summary of the Provisions of the Act and the Text of the Act itself. By the Rev. ALFRED T. LEE, LL.D. (London : The Church Defence Institution, 1880.)

THIS is a most useful and timely brochure. It is to be hoped that all who are concerned in the working of this Act will make themselves acquainted with the exact state of the matter as affected by the recent legislation. Nowhere will this be found more lucidly and temperately set forth than in Dr. Lee's pamphlet. It is not a subject for anything but regret and humiliation. But there is some humour in the following paragraph. 'There is nothing in the Act to prevent a woman officiating at a funeral. Neither is there any limit of age prescribed. A boy or girl of immature years has as much right to officiate under the Act as the most grave and learned divine.'